FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT BOARD

Sitting in the Flying Dutchman
Motor Inn, Bowmanville, Ontario,

VOLUME 3

Nethercut & Co. Ltd.,
Official Reporters
44 York Street
Toronto, Ontario
M5J 1R4.

Nethercut & Co. Ltd.
Toronto, Ontario

FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT BOARD

Sitting at the Flying Dutchman
Motor Inn, Bowmanville, Ontario,
on Thursday, September 29, 1977

Volume 3

BEFORE:

John Klenavic	-	Chairman
Reg Lang	-	Member
Ms. Ellan Derow	-	Member
Murray Duncan	-	Member
David Scott	-	Member
Kim Shikaze	-	Member
Peter M. Bird	-	Member
Clement W. Cheng	-	Member

Michael Warder	-	Acting Secretary
Brian Timmermans	-	Information Officer

APPEARANCES:

C.T. Grant	Counsel for Eldorado Nuclear Limited
S.E. Frost	Representative for Eldorado Nuclear Limited
R. Dakers	Representative for Eldorado Nuclear Limited
G. Colbourne	Representative for Eldorado Nuclear Limited

I N D E X

INTERVENORS:	PAGE
Volume 1	
Roger Paul Representing Save the Environment from Atomic Pollution (SEAP)	13
Volume 2	
Bruce Laird Representing Adjacent Landholders	49
Mrs. Elizabeth Pereira Resident of Port Hope	77
Dr. F.A. Prantl National Health & Welfare	96
Warren Lowes Resident of Orono, Ontario	127
Professor Cyril Carter	144
Dennis Brown, Province of Ontario and Beverley Thorpe	175
Gary Glover Ontario People's Energy Network	232
Michael Phillips Area resident	243
John Veldhuis Area resident	257
Bill Panta Resident of Port Granby	295
Volume 3	
Margaret Myer Durham Christian High School	311
Anna Hughes Morrish Women's Institute	314
Dorothy Boden Durham Region Field Naturalists	325

I N D E X

INTRODUCTION: PAGE

Volume 1

Roger Paul
Representing Save the Environment from Atomic Pollution (SEAP) 12

Volume 2

Bruce Laird
Representing Adjacent Landholders 45

Mrs. Elizabeth Peterta
Resident of Port Hope 77

Dr. F.A. Franti
National Health & Welfare 99

Warren Lewis
Resident of Ororo, Ontario 127

Professor Cyril Carter 144

Dennis Krown, Province of Ontario
and Beverley Thorne 175

Gary Glover
Ontario People's Energy Network 232

Michael Phillips
Area resident 243

John Valdinis
Area resident 257

Bill Fanta
Resident of Port Granby 264

Volume 3

Margaret Myer
Durham Christian High School 312

Anna Hughes
Morrish Women's Institute 314

Dorothy Boden
Durham Region Field Naturalists 323

I N D E X

INTERVENORS:	PAGE
Volume 3 (Cont'd.)	
Donna Elliott The Voice of Women	335
Jeff Gold Save the Environment from Atomic Pollution (SEAP)	350
Marjorie Ashby Resident of Port Britain	395
Gwen Best Resident of Port Hope	414
Tony McQuail Resident of Lucknow	467
Bill Borger Representing PANDA (People Against Nuclear Pollution Anywhere)	474
Ian Connerty Representing Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility	493
Chris Beatty Resident of Hope Township	516

Bowmanville, Ontario,
September 29th, 1977.

--- UPON COMMENCING AT 1:30 P.M.

THE CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon ladies and gentlemen. My name is John Klenavic. I am the chairman of the Environmental Assessment Panel convened to consider the proposal by Eldorado Nuclear for a uranium refinery at Port Granby.

I would like to take a few minutes to briefly outline what we are here for, our procedures and what we are doing after this first phase of the hearings is completed. Our purpose for having this hearing is to receive concerns to enable us to prepare a report to the Minister of the Environment of the federal government. In this report we are to make recommendations with respect to the potential environmental impact of the proposed project and recommend what measures should be undertaken to mitigate or eliminate this impact.

It is a broad scope within our recommendations as to what we want to include in our report based on the potential environmental impact and whether or not the project should go as is, go with modification or not go at all.

Our first phase of hearings will continue today and also next week in the Town of

Newcastle on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday. There are three purposes with this phase of our hearings. These purporses are to clarify points that are not understood about the project, to identify possible deficiencies in the environmental impact statement that was filed with the panel some time ago and which is the eleven hundred page document of which this is volume one. Our third purpose in being here is to identify concerns that the public may have about this proposed project.

Following this first phase of our hearings, the panel will determine the deficiencies in the environmental impact statement that require rectification by the proponent. We will also identify the issues that we wish to address in greater detail in our second phase of hearings. After the deficiencies have been corrected and there has been time for the public and ourselves to study them, we then proceed to the second phase of the hearings which is, as I mentioned, on an issue basis.

The idea of having issues is to publish in advance the specific topics we would like to address and to enable all parties and technical experts that are involved in this to be here on the same day and answer questions and sort out any problems that exist.

I might mention also that technical reviews of the environmental impact statement have been reviewed by various provincial and federal agencies and these have been provided to people who are interested in them. They are also available to anyone else who is further interested and may not have attended the earlier sessions.

The briefs presented to date, as well as the written submissions we have received are also available for anyone interested in them.

During the hearings we ask that each intervenor attempt to limit their remarks to fifteen minutes or less, and follow this with a question period. I would like to emphasize that the question period is directed at clarifying the remarks of the speaker, rather than presenting other points of view or starting a debate, which is the type of thing we would expect to get into in the second stage of our hearings. I would also like to advise those who may not have been here earlier that Eldorado has already received a number of questions, and I am sure working hard at answering them. We will probably get some indication today as to when they can provide the answers to the earlier questions.

We had announced earlier that the

hearings would be held on Tuesday evening, Wednesday afternoon and evening, and Thursday afternoon and evening of next week. We also intend at this stage to schedule an additional session on Thursday morning of next week to ensure that we have covered all of the people who want to speak and to also leave the Thursday evening of next week free for any unresolved questions that the panel may have or other members of the public.

At the end of each half day session, if time permits, we invite anyone who wishes to make a brief statement of concern or on any other matter to come forward and do so. If you have the opportunity, please register with Mr. Timmermans in advance, and we will call you in the order presented.

I have six speakers on the list for today, and I would like to read off who they are, as our list keeps changing minute to minute. I would like also to mention that we have representatives of the Durham Christian High School here today. I am very pleased to see them in terms of their involvement of what is going on here. I do not want to go into long remarks, but I am sure you will see many more of these types of hearings over the next few years when you are in a position to partake actively in them as you are doing today.

We have changed our schedule slightly to allow the Durham High School to make a presentation to start with. After the presentation of the Durham Christian High School, we have the Women's Institute, Mrs. Anna Hughes, followed by the Durham Region Field Naturalists-- Dorothy Bowden. We then have the Voice of Women. Then we have Save the Environment from Atomic Pollution, Jeff Gold. Then we have Marjorie Ashby and Gwen Best, a resident of Port Hope. That is the last list I have. If there are any corrections to that, you might see Mr. Timmermans and see what we can do to sort it out.

For this evening we have four speakers: Tony McQuail, resident of Lucknow; PANDA, People Against Nuclear Development Anywhere, Bill Borger; Coalition for Nuclear Reponsibility, Ian Connerty; and Chris Beatty. Again, if there are any changes, please see Mr. Timmermans.

I would like to now introduce the panel members here. On my right we have Ellan Derow, beside her is Clement Cheng, beside him is Peter Bird and Reg Lang. Starting from the far side, on my left, we have Kim Shikaze, beside him is Murray Duncan, beside him is David Scott. The gentleman to my immediate left is the panel secretary, Michael Warder.

When he is not at these hearings, he is available at our information centre in room 107 of this hotel, which is where we have all of this information available and where you may go if you wish more copies of anything. In our information sheets, available at the back of the room, we have indicated where you may get more information from our office in Ottawa. I might also introduce the people in the front. To the left we have our information officer, Brian Timmermans, and the court reporter, and that leads me to the fact that our proceedings are going to be available in transcripts, and in order to speak, would you please use the microphones and identify yourself when you speak. Beside the court reporter is a table for the intervenors as they are speaking, and the intervenors will rotate at the table as it is their turn. Across, on this side, we have the representatives from Eldorado. The table here we have for representatives of the media.

The final point, I might remind you that in our information brochure, we request no smoking in this room.

I think I have covered everything. We are now ready for our first speaker from the Durham Christian High School.

MARGARET MYER: My name is Margaret Myer, and I am here representing the students of Durham Christian High School.

We the undersigned young residents of this area wish to state our concerns on this issue in two areas:

(a) ethical - confessional
(b) economic - practical

(a) Ethical - confessional:

We challenge the assumption that "we need a new uranium refinery". We also challenge the perspective which breeds this assumption, namely (a) that humanity is the result of the evolutionary process whereby "man-like" creatures (monkeys) discovered tools, (b) that human history is the chronicle of these men trying to dominate nature with these tools in order to make themselves more comfortable and wealthy, and (c) that human society is a contrived arrangement whereby individuals can achieve their basic need to make anything they can think of--doing it the easiest possible way, making a market for it, selling it for as large a money profit as possible, and reinvesting the profit to make ourselves even more comfortable. Thirdly, we challenge the ethics of producing such dangerous materials and

then exporting them into the hands of people over which we have no control.

We have a different perspective on life and it leads us to believing in conserving energy, developing safer alternative energy sources and holding up justice as the norm for all our political-economic-social dealings; all this within the context of caring for rather than exploiting nature.

We make this challenge unsupported by arguments, proofs and data. We simply do not share the belief or the perspective whidh claims we need a nuclear refinery. We just plain believe something else. We don't want nuclear refineries.

(b) Economic - practical:

We do not believe that the construction of this nuclear plant (and others like it, as well as those such as Pickering) will provide a significant broad-base of economic benefits. We cannot see how the refinery will assist the farmer or the small businessman; we can only see how it will benefit a few, those who seem to already have more than their share.

Please do not think of us as a bunch of kids who cannot yet be responsible. As

people who will soon inherit the task of running our society we demand to be heard: we do not want a nuclear future, we will be quite pleased with a conserving energy future using alternative sources which will free us of radiation pollution at home and make our future just as safe from Nuclear War as we are today.

P.S. Just maybe, if we Canadians stop worshipping the almighty dollar, start conserving instead of wasting, and quit tempting less influential nations with fantastic potential to blow us all up, we may decide to make Justice a priority. What a novel idea!

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you Miss Myer. Are there any questions of the speaker?

I would like to congratulate you on being the first speaker for which there were no questions raised. It is a very useful precedent. Thank you for coming today, and thank you to the entire school group for coming. I certainly invite you to remain and hear the rest of these proceedings. I hope you will find them interesting.

Our next speaker is from the Morrish Women's Institute, Mrs. Anna Hughes.

MR. LANG: Mr. Chairman, I would

just like to ask a question. Will the presentor of that last brief be here for the afternoon? The reason I am asking is because most of the briefs have been presented and we have had a chance to read them. This one, we haven't. If we should decide to ask them a question later, will they still be around?

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand they want to leave at 3:30; therefore, I guess they will consider questions up until 3:30.

MRS. ANNA HUGHES: Mr. Chairman, and members of the panel, thank you very much for giving me this opportunity to speak on behalf of the Morrish Women's Institute.

Before I present their letter, I would like to fill you in a little bit on the Women's Institute. It was formed in 1897 at Stoney Creek, Ontario, through the combined efforts of Mr. Earland Lee of Farmer's Institute and Mrs. Adelaide Hoodless. The branch at Stoney Creek is still in operation. The object of this organization is to help women acquire sound and approved homemaking skills; to help discover, stimulate and develop leadership; to help identify and resolve needs and problems in the community; to promote the use of available resource material and to develop better informed, happier and

more useful citizens. The motto of the Women's Institute is 'For Home And Country'.

This constitution of the Institute was updated, as well as the bylaws, and revised and approved by the Honourable William Stuart, Ontario Minister of Agriculture and Food on the 15th of December, 1971.

Today I am speaking for the Morrish Women's Institute, and we are part of the central area. This is from Port Hope, on the east, to Brampton, on the west, and a line north to Ottawa. We have fourteen districts in the area and one hundred and forty-three branches at the present time with a membership three, six nine six. Toronto is the Ontario headquarters. We have a membership of three zero, five four four. We also do not stop with just Ontario. We cross this great Dominion of Canada and headquarters are in Ottawa. Last year we met in conference in Prince Edward Island. We do not stop there. We go to the associated country women of the world, with our office in London, England, and we have branches in fifty-six countries of the world. In October of this year we meet in our ACWW conference in Nairobi, Kenya. This year we celebrate our eightieth birthday of the founding of our organization in Ontario. On November 9 and 10 we will

be celebrating Central Ontario's seventy-fifth birthday, which was the first area, at the Royal York. You can see we are not a group of women that have just come out of nowhere to present a letter to this panel, but we have a great concern.

I am a farmer's daughter, raised in the area north of Port Hope, and I did live for years in Port Granby, so I definitely know the area of which we are speaking. The Morrish Women's Institute are women of that area and Port Hope.

We the members of Morrish Women's Institute, wish to add our support to the SEAP group efforts against the proposed nuclear refinery and dump site at Port Granby.

The Lakeshore area has long been known for its prosperous agricultural land and it is slowly being taken over by land developers and industry. The addition of another nuclear refinery and dump will definitely be polluting this area past its safety level. We have already found this problem throughout Port Hope and area now.

Other countries are looking into the possibilities of danger to lives from nuclear industries by pollution or accident. It is time Canada curtailed some of its expansion till safer methods are

available for these plants and the dumps that must handle the refuse.

What will be the price that our future generations must pay for the neglect and carelessness of today? Signed by the President, Mrs. R. Hughes, and the Secretary, Mrs. M. Hodgson.

I would also like to say that I am living in Port Hope at the present time, and we have had quite a bit of trouble with the radiation. It has reduced the value of our homes. About a year ago, at three or four different times, we had people come into our homes to test the air and this, that and the other, which I do not think anybody appreciates. There are one or two boards in my house marked. Nothing has been done to the present time. They still have the tickets that they put on. If I put my house up for sale, there would be no way that house could be sold until it was cleared of that radiation. So I think we in the Morrish Women's Institute have a great concern that another plant not be built until at least this one is cleared up.

Thank you very much.

MR. LANG: Mrs. Hughes, your second concern is pollution past the safety level. You're referring to radioactivity.

MRS. HUGHES: Yes.

MR. LANG: So I understand you correctly, then, the other two concerns you have are that the rural character of the area is going to change as a result of industrial development like this?

MRS. HUGHES: That is right.

MR. LANG: And there is some danger from nuclear accident.

MRS. HUGHES: Yes.

MR. LANG: I would just generally like to ask a question towards the Eldorado group. There have been a number of expressions here of concern about the new refinery, based on experience with the old one. I get the impression from the Environmental Impact Statement that you are saying that experience would not be repeated. Would that be a fair summary?

MR. GRANT: As you may or may not know, the problem in Port Hope was virtually a short-term historical problem where there might have been some rather careless disposal of waste material. This waste material ended up in areas in the community where we know now it should not have ended up. So that while Port Hope is a problem, and a very sensitive problem and one of great concern to local residents, with respect to this refinery, as we have discussed in our

EIS, the proposal is not to allow that kind of thing to happen to the residue and, therefore, I do not see that apart from that there is any meaningful comparison to what happened in Port Hope to what might happen in Port Granby.

I do not know if that answers your question, Mr. Lang, but that is the answer.

MR. BIRD: Perhaps I could pursue that line of questioning a little further. Mr. Grant, could you tell us a little more about the type of waste that was disposed of, you say now perhaps incorrectly, and has been the cause of the problems in Port Hope. Over what period of time was that disposal? Was it in fact related to an entirely different production operation as distinct to what is going on there now and, of course, what is or will be going on in the Port Granby operation.

MR. GRANT: I will ask Mr. Colbourne or Mr. Frost to deal with that one.

MR. COLBOURNE: Yes, Doctor Bird, it was an entirely different process. At the point in time when most of the contamination got into the Town of Port Hope, it did not get there as a result of residue as residue being spread around town. It was primarily from contaminated fill. In other words, there

was construction going on at the refinery. Some of the fill was removed from the refinery, supposedly to go to the residue areas. Some of it found its way around the town through devious means. We are just not sure how it got there, but I would like to make one point, that it was during the radium days and the processing was entirely different from what we propose at Port Granby. Secondly, that it was not residue as residue but just contaminated fill from construction.

MR. GRANT: Perhaps, Doctor Bird, you may not be aware that Eldorado has not produced radium at the refinery in Port Hope since 1963, and we are not proposing, of course, to produce radium at Port Granby.

MR. BIRD: Thank you. I was aware of the change. I was not completely sure of the date. From what you have said, it is evident that the contamination that was spread around Port Hope was basically radium and that in fact the plant is not now handling radium, so the prospects of a similar situation are vastly different today. There is of course some radium being conveyed through the yellowcake, and your EIS document tells us, to some extent, what quantities of radium may be involved, but they are, presumably, substantially different in order of magnitude as

compared to what you were handling at the Port Hope refinery prior to 1953.

MR. GRANT: That is correct.

MR. CHENG: Mrs. Hughes, I would like a minor point of clarification. Are you speaking on behalf of the entire Women's Institute which, as you mentioned, stretches from Brampton to Ottawa, comprised of three to four thousand people?

MRS. HUGHES: No, I am speaking as the Morrish Women's Institute, of which we are a part of that area. So I am just speaking as the branch at Morrish, really.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions from the panel? Any questions from the floor?

MR. VELDHUIS: Mrs. Hughes, could you explain what the objects are of the Women's Institute nationally? How do they feel about this particular nuclear process that we presently seem to be engaged in?

MRS. HUGHES: As far as nationally, I don't think they are concerned. But we are a part of this. I was just trying, by telling you what we are, to tell you what the Institute was and why we would be interested in this by giving you what

the Institute stood for. I think the Institute, as a whole, national or otherwise, if there is something that concerns the area in which an institute is a member, it is the responsibility of that institute to either express their concern or their agreement at a hearing concerning that project. We could not possibly reach the national level on one section because they would have no way of being in contact with it. But it is as we are a member of that whole thing. I feel it is our obligation, you might say, to express our opinion on these things that are happening through our branch in that particular area, of which they are a part. It was just to let you know that we were not one of these fly-by-night organizations that you hear about, and that we were concerned with Ontario right back to 1897. Does that answer your question?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think it does. Thank you.

Are there any further questions?

MR. GRANT: Just two things: where is Morrish, in the first place, and what is the approximate population?

MRS. HUGHES: I could not tell you just what the approximate population of Morrish is, but the original Institute was originally at

Morrish, which is Morrish Church, out on Highway No. 2 here, pretty nearly directly east of us, is where the Institute was organized. Now it carries from the boundaries of practically Clark, down to Port Hope. It takes in Port Hope, and north to the No. 2 Highway.

MR. GRANT: Is it a village, or a town?

MRS. HUGHES: No. It is just about a church there. But the Morrish Women's Institute takes in all that territory in there.

MR. GRANT: How many members would the Morrish chapter have?

MRS. HUGHES: Around twenty-five. But these are mostly the rural people, or have been rural people of the area of Port Granby, Westleyville and this area-- Port Hope.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any further questions?

MR. BIRD: Mrs. Hughes, you have certainly expressed some very strong opinions about this on behalf of your group. You also, in describing the historical background of the Institute, mentioned that there are regional and national component bodies and so on. Would it be your expectation or plan to put a proposal to a regional meeting to try to get a

wider support for the views that you have expressed. It certainly seems to me that more people that join forces, the stronger is your case. I am sure that was the point Mr. Grant was trying to find out-- what size of group you were representing. Do you feel that the organization will produce a resolution for perhaps a regional meeting to support an opposition to nuclear refineries or nuclear power plants, or something of that nature to try and get it up to the level of a national one, perhaps even at the world meeting that is going to be taking place at Nairobi, as you mentioned?

MRS. HUGHES: At the present time we have no thought of carrying it that far, or any further than our own branch or the area directly concerned here in this part of Ontario. There are one or two other branches in this part of the area, but they are not in direct contact, as we are here, as farmers and those that have lived in the area and perhaps retired to Port Hope. This is where some of our members are at the present time. But we do feel that this is the area that is concerned with it at the present time.

MR. BIRD: Do I interpret from that that your concern is with the particular proposal of locating a plant here, not so much with

the matter of the whole concept of nuclear facilities?

MRS. HUGHES: I think the whole thing needs more study before anything is done as to what it will be and what effects it will have. This is my personal opinion as to what effects it will have on the country. We do feel in our branch at Morrish that we are concerned with the Lakeshore from Newcastle and through to Port Hope, especially. A lot of this land is good agricultural land, and it has been taken up by industry. We are on a waterfront, and we feel that we need this good agricultural land. Further north, when you go a hundred miles or so, it is mostly rocky country, and we feel this land should not be wasted under cement.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions?

Thank you, Mrs. Hughes.

Our next speaker is the Durham Region Field Naturalists, Dorothy Boden.

DOROTHY BODEN: Good afternoon. I am speaking on behalf of the Durham Region Field Naturalists which were formerly known as the Oshawa Naturalists Club. We are a federated member in the Federation of Ontario Naturalists. There are approximately 12,000 members in that organization. In

our own local club there are three to four hundred members, to the best of my knowledge. I do not have the latest membership number.

As naturalists, we question the ecological soundness of building a refinery and locating a dump site on an area bounded by streams draining into Lake Ontario. With erosion on the north shore of the lake occuring at approximately one meter per year, we question the wisdom of burying there wastes containing toxic and radioactive substances.

The thermal pollution due to discharge of cooling water into the lake has been described as insignificant. The same description has been used to describe Ontario Hydro's thermal discharges from the proposed Darlington Nuclear Generating Station, as well as the Pickering Station. As nuclear facilities continue to expand along Lake Ontario's shoreline we can expect an increase in the amount of thermal pollution, which will alter the life cycles of the flora and fauna of the shoreline. What will be the combined effects of thermal discharges from nuclear installations on Lake Ontario? Just how much more can the lake absorb from both sides of the border?

As a federated member club in the Federation of Ontario Naturalists, our club concurs with a resolution passed at the F.O.N. annual conference this spring (1977). Although this resolution relates specifically to provincial plans for nuclear expansion, I believe it bears repeating here. I quote, therefore, from the August 1977 edition of the "Ontario Naturalist":

> "Despite increasing province-wide concern for the negative consequences of the development of nuclear power, this province's planned nuclear program is one of the world's largest. Increasing evidence points to the economic, environmental and social attractiveness of alternate energy policies of conservation and renewable energy. Be it therefore resolved that the Federation of Ontario Naturalists urges the government of Ontario to adopt the following energy policy:

1) those nuclear power stations under operation continue to produce electricity;

2) those nuclear power stations under construction be completed and produce electricity;

3) any further nuclear planning or construction be halted until 1995.

In lieu of further nuclear development the Government be urged to shift investment priorities to energy conservation and the development of renewable energy."

The philosophy expressed in this resolution leads us to the conclusion that we cannot support the existence on Ontario soil of a facility built with the purpose of producing materials to promote the proliferation of nuclear power at home and abroad.

Another aspect of Eldorado's proposed expansion has not been covered in their Environmental Impact Study-- that is the necessity to quadruple uranium mining operations in northern Ontario

in order to supply the raw material for the new refinery. Again we come to the question of how much more stress due to such operations can the eco-system around such areas as Elliott Lake be subjected to without permanent scarring? This is a matter that must be considered in these hearings if they are to be meaningful.

Although public environmental review process is necessary and we welcome these hearings, some inequities are evident in the manner in which parties are financially able to prepare presentations for public hearings. The SEAP-Port Granby group wished to do technical and legal research in order to present their view as comprehensively as Eldorado Nuclear Limited was able to. While Eldorado, a Crown corporation, was able to command the use of abundant financial resources to prepare their study, SEAP's request for federal funding for a similar study has, to date, been ignored. This type of action is not peculiar to these hearings. Environmental groups consistently are faced with stumbling blocks at every turn when trying to prepare for hearings. Members of such groups are concerned citizens, usually employed full-time in other jobs. In contrast, corporations such as Eldorado Nuclear are able to hire

full-time technical and research people to conduct studies for them. Citizens groups are non-profit, raising funds through memberships and voluntary contributions. Eldorado spent $1 million and two years of full-time work preparing their Environmental Impact Statement. The public has had three months to examine this statement and prepare a reply. I would ask the panel to keep these inequities in mind when weighing the value of presentations made to them at these hearings.

My concluding remark is this: We feel it is time for a general stock-taking before proceeding full speed ahead with nuclear expansion programs. Examination of our life-style and priorities is called for, in order that we may see accurately how man fits into the overall scheme of life on this planet.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you Mrs. Boden.

MR. DUNCAN: Mrs. Boden, you have covered a number of areas of general interest to people attending this panel, and we have heard similar views, and I appreciate your reiterating them. There are a few points I would like to get confirmation on and also if you could provide us with some information,

it would be very helpful. The first item in your first paragraph you mention erosion on the north shore and the approximate rate. We certainly appreciate the information you have to establish this kind of number. Could we possibly get some backup to that?

MRS. BODEN: I can tell you where this figure came from. I have also read that point three four metres on the Province of Ontario presentation last night, and I believe it is in some of Eldorado's literature. The figure I quoted in this article is taken from the publication "Why Not Port Granby", put out by SEAP, Newtonville.

MR. DUNCAN: On the second page, you presented what is a very common sense energy policy. The third item in that is, "any further nuclear planning or construction be halted until 1995." I am interested in knowing what you would propose occur subsequent to 1995, or even how you arrive at that date. I am reading this as a moratorium situation, and I would like to know how you arrived at that time period.

MRS. BODEN: To get at an accurate answer to that question I would have to refer you to the Federation of Ontario Naturalists because that is a direct quote from the resolution that was passed at

their annual convention.

MR. DUNCAN: I would appreciate the background to it, if you could get it for us.

MRS. BODEN: I am sure I can.

MR. DUNCAN: Further down that page you made a statement about the necessity to quadruple uranium mining operations in northern Ontario in order to supply the raw materials for a new refinery. Again there is a number, the quadrupling aspect. The concern of the whole nuclear fuel cycle, as you mentioned later on, is a very important one, and I was wondering how you arrived at the quadrupling aspect.

MRS. BODEN: I would like to refer you back to a newspaper article in the Globe and Mail. I cannot give you the date because I do not have the article with me, but this was a news report and unlike some people, I do believe things I read in the newspaper.

MR. DUNCAN: The basic point I believe you are making in that paragraph is an indication of a need in the assessment of the whole nuclear fuel cycle. Am I right in that assumption? I am infering that from what you have said.

MRS. BODEN: Yes, because it involves so many different areas in the province geographically, and of the ecological environment of

these areas.

MR. DUNCAN: Would you extend it beyond the boundaries of the province?

MRS. BODEN: I am concerned world-wide with the nuclear question, firstly, very much so.

MR. SHIKAZE: Mrs. Boden, the field naturalists club and all others associated with the Ontario Field Naturalists are involved in a lot of sort of volunteer oriented activities. By volunteer, I mean they undertake on their own a lot of field investigations, bird counts and this kind of activity. Has the Durham Region Field Naturalists club undertaken any such activity around the Port Granby area, and have you reviewed the environmental impact statement with respect to that aspect?

MRS. BODEN: We have not done an in-depth review of the statement. We have studied it in order to prepare this brief. Our club at this time has no committee or investigative team working on, say, an alternate statement in the Port Granby area. Our resources have been almost totally involved in an environmental study in Ontario Municipal Board hearings into the Oshawa second marsh situation. We find that we can only spread ourselves so thin.

MR. SHIKAZE: So you have not

done any work in the Port Granby area.

MRS. BODEN: No, we have not.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any further questions from panel members?

MR. CHENG: The question was raised as to why 1995? I don't know what it can add to this, but the members of the Porter Commission mentioned a planning date of 1995. It might have something to do with that.

MRS. BODEN: That is quite possible. That can be clarified through the FON in Toronto, which I can do for you.

MR. BIRD: Mr. Chairman, I expect that Eldorado will be responding, but it will be interesting to ask them to give us their perception on the statement about the necessity to quadruple the uranium mining operations in Northern Ontario and to find out what their perceptions are as compared to the statement in the Globe and Mail.

MR. GRANT: I think that question comes up in connection with some of the matters raised by the Ministry of the Environment. They raised it specifically as to processing of Ontario ore now and in the future, and I think the answer will come from that. It is something we cannot give you off

the cuff. We did give, on the first night, some indications of Canadian production in an overall point of view, but I think that information will come out of the answer to one of the questions which I think appears on page six of their study.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions from the floor?

MR. JOHN GIMBLETT: Mrs. Boden, one opinion I would ask you about is that in the documentation of the DIS, do you feel that it should be site specific only, or do you think it should include the adjacent land?

MRS. BODEN: In my humble opinion, I think it should include the adjacent lands. The ecology or agricultural value of the entire area should be assessed, as far as I am concerned.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any further question?

Thank you Mrs. Boden. Our next speaker is the Voice of Women. I do not have the name of the representative.

DONNA ELLIOTT: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, my name is Donna Elliott and I am a national coordinator of the Voice of Women.

The Voice of Women was formed as a

National organization seventeen (17) years ago when there was a large outcry against atmospheric testing. The failure of the Paris Summit Conference left the impression that nothing could prevent the drift to nuclear war. A Toronto Star columnist asked "What can women do?". This column triggered enormous response from women who declared their willingness and need to do something. Many women asked themselves, "Can we live with ourselves if any children suffer the effects of one atomic bomb?"

Now you may ask, what do the effects of an atomic bomb have to do with these hearings? Well, atomic weapons create large amounts of radiation, and uranium refineries and tailing dumps also create radiation. Radioactive materials in the biosphere occur naturally and as the result of human technology. Radioactive materials move throughout the environment and ecosystems in the same way as non-radioactive materials. We must protect ourselves from contact with these materials by identifying the paths by which the various radio-isotopes can move from air, water and ground through the food chain and to human beings.

The knowledge of the movement of radio-isotopes through the environment is sketchy and clouded by many uncertainties. Large quantities of

human-made radioactive materials are accumulating at ever increasing rates. We now know it is not enough to keep the concentrations of radioactivity in the air, water, and ground to specified minimum levels because of the biological concentration of some chemicals. As radio-isotopes move up a food chain, they may be concentrated to thousands or even millions of times their original concentration in the air or water. There is no doubt that radioactive substances are carcinogenic, mutagenic and capable of inducing many diseases.

The determination of 'acceptable' dose limits is a very difficult, perhaps insoluble, ethical problem. If there were some level of radioactive pollution which would not cause death or suffering, then it would be easy to set standards, but it has been firmly established that any radioactive exposure, no matter how small, carries with it some risk of cancer induction and hereditary effects. The ICRP (International Commission on Radiological Protection) has repeatedly recommended that "all doses be kept as low as is readily achievable, taking into consideration economic and social factors". It would appear that the significance of this recommendation is that the ICRP acknowledges that the doses permitted by a society depend on the values that society attaches to human

life and to the well being of future generations. It is therefore impossible for an international committee to set dose limits. It is also significant to note that maximum permissible dose limits have been lowered five times in the last 50 years. As A.H. Booth, Chairman of the National Research Council of Canada says:

> "Energy level of radiation carries with it some risk even though it may be very small. It is now generally agreed that there is no 'threshold' - no level so low that the possibility of producing an adverse health effect completely disappears. This being so, the question as to what level is 'safe' is a matter of opinion only. The best that even a recognized authority such as the ICRP can do is tell us what in its collective wisdom it thinks we could consider negligible or acceptable. You see, setting a maximum permissible

dose is not entirely or even principally a scientific exercise. It is a value judgment that even the man-in-the-street can just as well have an opinion about."

The "low as readily achievable" criterion also raises the question of how localized decision making should be. While few would dispute the right of an international or national body to set minimum standards, why shouldn't a province or even a municipality be allowed to set more stringent requirements for projects within its own geographical jurisdiction. Even if it is possible to set meaningful dose standards, the application and enforcement of the standards poses additional problems and potential for human error.

The surprise expressed by members of the nuclear industry when confronted with public reaction to the problem of waste management is an outstanding illustration of the inability of the technical community to understand public perception of the social impact of nuclear technology.

Uranium, after it is mined, is physically and chemically processed. These processes

result in the production of large volumes of low-level radioactive waste. The bulk of this is in the form of a sandlike residue called tailing, which contains much of the radioactive material that was present in the original ore. These tailings which emit gamma rays and radon gas, present a radioactive waste problem because of the material which prior to mining and milling is locked in the earth's crust and is very dilute, becomes concentrated in easily dispersed gaseous and particulate forms. These wastes remain radioactive for thousands of years.

Dean Abrahmson has pointed out that "As wastes, their management is a 'nonproductive' activity. As with other pollution control, the money spent to build or operate waste control systems does not increase the desired output of the enterprise."

In the case of wastemanagement this could well lead to negligence of the problem and misplaced priorities within the industry. Until recently tailings from commercial radium and uranium mining operations were left in open piles to be washed away into local waterways. This practice led to contamination of Elliott Lake and Quirke Lake to levels of radioactivity several times permissible concentrations. Similar negligence at the refining

stage of the commercial nuclear industry resulted in radioactive rubble and fill being used as construction and landscape material in Port Hope.

As with other areas of the Canadian nuclear industry the management of low and medium level wastes has never been subjected to public scrutiny or independent scientific review. The obvious discrepancy between public and industry standards recently exhibited at Port Hope and other communities, gives us no reason to suspect the results of such an investigation would be different from those of a recent public enquiry in the U.S. There is the natural tendency to seek the cheapest possible solution which meets the safety and responsibility criteria. A study of the history of waste management in the Canadian nuclear power program reveals that virtually every decision taken and every policy adopted has been in favour of the cheapest solution at the expense of public safety and responbility to future generations.

A project such as Eldorado has planned would require Canadians to accept the environmental damage and the risks involved in the project for the benefit of foreign producers, foreign consumers and foreign shareholders.

Finally, I am reminded of something

I once read by Elting Morison:

> "We should begin with the idea that the technological universe should be designed to fit and serve the human dimension. Whatever is good for us is the greatest possible good that can be allowed to General Motors or any other makers and shakers of modern times. What is merely financially attractive or technically interesting must give way before the superior claims of the human condition."

We are aware that all development affects the people as well as the environment, and the costs or benefits to both must be carefully assessed before any new project is undertaken.

It is for these reasons and others that the Voice of Women opposes the construction of an additional uranium refinery and another 50 acres of nuclear dump here in Ontario, indeed anywhere in the world.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you

Mrs. Elliott. We would like a copy of your brief. Any questions from the panel?

MR. LANG: You begin from a position that is opposed to nuclear power, and therefore you are opposed to the Port Granby site. Not the other way around.

MRS. ELLIOTT: Seventeen years ago we began from a position opposed to nuclear testing because of the radioactive pollution caused by testing. That led us down the path to nuclear power very recently and here today.

MR. LANG: You would be opposed to a facility like this at any location then?

MRS. ELLIOTT: Technically, yes. But of course I think we realize that we have to have a dump because we have already existing wastes. There has to be a dump somewhere.

MR. LANG: But not a new refinery?

MRS. ELLIOTT: That's right.

MR. LANG: Perhaps before whoever gave that high school brief leaves, I would like to ask the same question of that person, after we are finished here.

MS. DEROW: Could you describe more about your organization, where you are located and

the number of members you represent?

MRS. ELLIOTT: The Voice of Women is a national organization. It stretches right from Vancouver Island to the Northwest Territories, right through to Newfoundland. We have active groups in all the major centres in Canada.

I don't know what else to say. In terms of membership, I can give you a figure in around the seven hundred bracket. But I am rather not too impressed with figures. I don't think is a very impressive figure. I think we should think in terms of the kind of people we attract. All across Canada the Voice of Women has sponsored meetings on specifically nuclear energy and we have attracted thousands of people.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any questions from the floor?

Perhaps the Christian High School representatives, are you interested and prepared to answer Reg Lang's question?

MR. LANG: The question was whether you start from the position of being opposed to nuclear power and that leads to be opposed to this refinery, or the other way around.

MARGARET MYER: We start from

being opposed to nuclear power and therefore we are opposed to the Port Granby refinery.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are not opposed, or your argument does not take any specific opposition to Port Granby, but only because it is a nuclear facility.

MARGARET MYER: That's right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any further questions?

MR. JOHN GIMBLETT: I have one question I would like to ask. Do you mean to give this group the impression that you feel the proponent will seek the cheapest solution to any problems that might arise out of their installation?

MRS. ELLIOTT: I think that has been the history in the past. I think that is what the statement says.

MR. GRANT: I'm sorry. You think that has been Eldorado's history in the past, to seek the cheapest solution to the problem?

MRS. ELLIOTT: Yes.

MR. GRANT: Do you have any evidence of that?

MRS. ELLIOTT: I can only quote the source in the brief, and that would be the Ontario

Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility has presented that to the Porter Commission. It is a coalition of which the Voice of Women is part of. I have it here today, but it is six hundred pages long.

MR. GRANT: I would be interested in knowing what evidence there is that my client has solved serious problems by reference to the cheapest methods only. It may have found the cheapest method, but that does not necessarily mean that it is not the best method.

MR. CHENG: Mrs. Elliott, I wonder, for my curiosity, if nuclear power is the only other primary concern of your group. Do you have any others?

MRS. ELLIOTT: Nuclear power is only in front of our group because of its connotations with radioactive pollution. The Voice of Women is basically a disarmament organization. Our priority is disarmament, specifically nuclear disarmament.

MS. DEROW: You discuss safety levels as related to social values. You are bringing up a very complex problem, the control of technology in society. In your organization, and I am not sure if you can speak for your whole organization, but could you describe how best you would see this setting of

safety values in our society in Ontario or in this community? You did discuss community control. How can we best determine if indeed with the expert advice we are getting on safety levels there is the contention that it should be done in other ways.

MRS. ELLIOTT: I think I can only answer that in a very general way. Safety, in terms that no one gets harmed by it. I don't know. I am sure I don't know how else to answer.

MS. DEROW: To make sure it is harmful?

MRS. ELLIOTT: Yes, that's true, but these are imposed upon us. I don't think-- I don't see the necessity of it, and specifically here, because this product is for export. I wonder why Canadians should take the brunt of hazards for a product that is for export. I am sure I don't know how to go into that.

MS. DEROW: If you make the contention that it should be termed socially, and you are saying economic should not be the basis on which we determine it. We need alternatives on how best, in this very complex society, which we are already in the midst of nuclear concerns, so that we can determine adequate safety levels.

MRS. ELLIOTT: I think that is a whole other ball of wax.

MS. DEROW: No.

MRS. ELLIOTT: I don't know if it comes in. I can only refer you, again, to my source, the brief to the Porter Commission.

MR. JOHN VELDHUIS: Is it permissible, Mr. Chairman, to ask a question of clarification on an earlier question that Eldorado asked? I am a bit confused. In talking about the Port Granby dump, the existing Port Granby dump, the question was asked about safety cheapness or best answer. I am not quite sure. Is the Port Granby dump the best answer for the company, the safest answer for all the people, or is it the cheapest answer to the problem of waste storage?

MR. GRANT: Are you talking about the existing residue disposal area?

MR. VELDHUIS: Yes.

MR. GRANT: The fact is, and it is actually academic to discuss whether it is the best, the cheapest or whatever. The fact is that it is there and it has been there for getting on to twenty years. I don't know what the relevance is as to whether it is the cheapest and the best. We are

not asking this panel to consider the existing residue disposal area, so I am not prepared to answer that question.

MR. VELDHUIS: I think I will say no further at this time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any further questions of the speaker?

I think this is an appropriate time for the coffee break.

--- SHORT RECESS

--- UPON RESUMING

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, we will reconvene.

Our next speaker is Jeff Gold, Save the Environment from Atomic Pollution.

MR. GOLD: Before I begin I would like to clarify that I am representing the Darlington chapter of SEAP, which, although affiliated with SEAP in Port Granby, is maintaining an independent position in all other matters.

I would also like to ask for the forgiveness of the panel and the audience if my brief does not follow precisely the submission that I may put before you.

When we use the word environment in its widest possible implications, we include the social, intellectual and moral environments that we inhabit as surely as our physical environment. It is only in this context that the issue of the proposed Port Granby refinery can be fully illuminated.

No industry can be considered separate from the social structures, economic system and communal ideals which are essential for its continued survival. The nuclear industry in particular must be attentive to the fundamental question raised

by its very existence: What kind of future do we want?

Will our children inherit a world that has exhausted its resources and poisoned the air, land and seas, or a world where waste has been eliminated, resources conserved and the quality of life improved?

Obviously, questions of this nature cannot be answered by any group of experts or government body. They must be answered by an informed citizenry.

Government, industry and public utilities, distrustful and disdainful of the collective wisdom of the people, have spent millions promoting nuclear power. The voices of reasonable opposition have been drowned out.

Concerned citizens must have an equal voice with corporate structures when the shape of the future is being determined. The opportunity and the funds to do this can and should be provided by government.

An educated populace, fully informed about the consequence of the continued growth of the nuclear industry, has the necessary wisdom to choose correctly. But as long as the expansion of the nuclear industry is discussed as a purely economic or technological problem, there will be no satisfactory

solution.

The approval or abandonment of the Port Granby refinery has consequences that reach far beyond the shores of Lake Ontario. No expense, time or effort must be spared to insure that all voices have been heard and everyone made aware of the magnitude of the basic issues.

We have an opportunity to choose from among many possible tomorrows. Please, let us choose carefully.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you Mr. Gold.

MR. SCOTT: Looking at the brief, Mr. Gold, I am struck by two very powerful operative words in this paragraph. First it says, "Obviously, questions of this nature cannot be answered by any group of experts or government body. They must be answered by an informed citizenry." The second was concerning an educated populace.

I find myself in an extremely difficult position in something like this where there is a judgment involved on the part of somebody to decide sooner or later who is an educated or informed citizen. I don't offer any solution to the very difficult problem of how to we choose who to believe. I was

wondering if you would amplify on that particular point as to who is an informed citizen and who is an educated citizen, and to what level does one have to go to decide whether a particular person is educated enough to make a decision.

MR. GOLD: I will handle that in two parts. First, the fact that this panel exists at all should be sufficient evidence that government agencies are well aware of the lack of knowledge in the general public concerning the problem that is before the panel at the present time. The fact that there are a large number of people representing the general community is also sufficient evidence that the community itself is aware of the lack of information available to itself and to in fact almost anybody in society concerning all the possible consequences of continuing development in society as represented by Eldorado.

Now, the nuclear industry must be willing to admit that the basic problem here is not a technological problem. I am sure everyone here is well aware that the technologists are attempting to take every precaution to ensure that a minimum amount of damage is done to the environment. The question behind that realization is, is any damage to the environment

acceptable at all. This point has been raised by other people in various forums.

The same techniques that have been used to popularize an increased demand or increased usage of electricity in Ontario could also be used to educate people about the consequences of the growth of the nuclear industry, and the funds to do that should really come from the nuclear industry itself. It is their responsibility to society to ensure that everything is being done correctly. The nuclear industry should heave a sigh of relief at having the opportunity to do that because then the decision is lifted from their shoulder. They are no longer being held solely responsible for deciding whether society should move towards a more centralized economy--centralization of processing equipment, as represented by the nuclear industry. It is essentially concentration of materials in one locality and distribution of power to many localities. That mode of producing and distributing energy takes a certain social structure. If we increase the nuclear industry, we will be committing society to a certain manner of living for many years to come. Just think the capital that will be consumed in the nuclear industry alone will limit the alternatives that are

available to society as far as changing life style or even changing the bare basic energy consumption paths.

MS. DEROW: Your brief is very general, and I would like to see if we could perhaps discuss in more specific detail this particular installation in view of your brief. I am particularly interested in paragraph two, in other words, "No industry can be considered separate from the social structures, economic system and communal ideas which are essential for its continued survival."

In view of your concern with Darlington and this development, could you be perhaps a little more specific especially about the relationship of this industry and the impact on social structure?

MR. GOLD: I am sure everyone here realizes that the nuclear industry is an interdependent industry. The technology on which it is based represents a common pool of industrial resources that are shared mostly by other industries and particularly by the nuclear industry, whether it is Eldorado or Ontario Hydro or Chalk River or uranium waste being handled for disposal-- the problems are common for the nuclear industry. The technology is common to the whole industry. That is why I am able to be so general in the brief.

Eldorado, in particular, in the environment pattern, considered in its environment, first in the local level in the Port Granby area, it has been well pointed out that this is basically a rural agricultural area and any industry connected with the process of nuclear material should not be located anywhere near rural areas, and especially near the shore of a large lake upon which millions of people depend for their drinking water. In other words, the consequences of even the smallest mistake in operating procedure in a plant such as that can have truly catastrophic implications to the local area and to literally millions of millions of people in the surrounding area. Those grounds alone are sufficient to condemn that particular project in that particular locality.

On a national scale, Eldorado has a very favoured spot in the Canadian economic scene. It is a Crown corporation. It is ultimately supposed to be responsible to the public sector for its behaviour, its purposes and its very existence, as a matter of fact. On a national level, Eldorado was created by the federal government for a specific purpose. Presumably the federal government was acting on behalf of the interests of all Canadians. If the

interests of Canadians change, hopefully the federal government will take note of that and alter the situation accordingly. If the majority of Canadians decide that their future is not a nuclear one, hopefully the federal government will act to dissolve Eldorado or limit its activities.

On a worldwide scale, placing Eldorado in relation to the whole world, it is producing this extremely poisonous material-- these by-products after use are the most poisonous known to man and it is almost freely distributing it around the world. The criterion for the purchase of nuclear materials are much too slack. As a matter of fact, there should not be any export of nuclear materials. If Canada can take a position in the world where they are opting-- where Canada as a whole is opting for a non-nuclear future, they will be able to have a very broad influence on what happens in the rest of the world. Canada is a major supplier or uranium.

MR. LANG: I think when you are speaking there of nuclear, you seem to be grouping all nuclear together. I would like to pursue Ellan's question from a different part of your brief. On the second page, second last paragraph, you refer to the "consequences that reach far beyond the shores of Lake

Ontario." You spoke a few minutes ago about catastrophic consequences as far as operation of this particular plant is concerned. Let's for the moment leave out nuclear power plants and concentrate on the uranium refining. What catastrophic consequences did you have in mind?

MR. GOLD: Perhaps a slow leakage of radioactive materials over a long period of time into the lake. I understand that all assurances will be given by the company that the lake water will be continuously monitored as far as radioactive contents. The point I am making is that no leakage would ever be permissible-- would ever be welcome.

MR. LANG: Apparently you are not satisfied that this will be the case. Even with monitoring there would be some emission of radioactive material.

MR. GOLD: Yes. I am sorry I have to take such an extreme position, but I believe that it is only a mad man who would propose to bury nuclear waste material of any potential hazard on the shores of a major lake such as Lake Ontario in a populated region like southern Ontario. The original proposal is so outrageous that only the seriousness of the people who are proposing it allows people to accept

that it is worthy of discussion.

MR. LANG: I am trying to understand your position. You must see that as being a relatively high probability, or do you see it as a low probability, but, nonetheless, when it happens, it is such a risk that it ought not to be done at all.

MR. GOLD: You are really asking a question of me that would have to be answered by someone knowledgeable in--

MR. LANG: No, of you that either says you believe that the risk here is extremely high, irrespective of how probable it is, we cannot afford to take any risks at all, or you are saying that you have evaluated the risk, whether you do it in any manner at all inside your head, and you think this in fact could happen, and it is quite easy for this to happen-- this leakage into the lake.

MR. GOLD: I would say yes to both. I foresee from my limited technical background the possibility of leakage into the lake, in spite of all precautions. Also, from another point of view, I see that there is no point in creating a possible risk of a leakage. The easiest way to prevent any possible risk is do not have the dump area. That is a very easy decision to make. In other words, nothing will be

lost if that decision is made and many things will be gained.

MR. LANG: I would like to pursue that a little further. The dump is already there. There is a dump there now. Hopefully, if you believe the environmental impact statement, there would be some improvement achieved by removing the radioactive material. We will be getting to that later, but do you believe that-- that there will be some improvement achieved by the moveage of this material from one type of dump to a new dump? In other words, I am wondering if you see any benefits in this proposal at all?

MR. GOLD: No.

MR. LANG: Because if we can believe this, and this were not to proceed, if the waste were to remain where it is, there is already a dump there with waste that is presumably leaking off into the lake.

MR. GOLD: Yes, under ideal conditions, that waste would be removed to a locality where major population centres would not be immediately endangered in long-term discharge of radioactive waste.

MR. BIRD: Does this mean that you feel that there is no such thing as a safe level of

radioactivity?

MR. GOLD: Well, I can only-- I take that as a personal question because, as the brief of the Voice of Women pointed out, and I agree with this, there is a judgment that is made in assessing all the technical information, finally you have to make a judgment as to what you are going to accept as an acceptable level. I agree with them that no level of man-made nuclear-- no increase of radioactivity from man-made sources is acceptable at all, anywhere, at any time.

MR. BIRD: What does this mean to you in terms of the future outlook for society in Canada? What sort of society do you see?

MR. GODL: At the present point in time, taking Ontario as an example, the amount of total energy consumed by society, the percentage of that represented by nuclear power is rather small. If I am wrong, I would like to be corrected. It is in the neighbourhood of five percent of the total energy consumption of the province is represented by output of nuclear power plants. If we were to shut those plants down, it would not cost serious or lasting harm to society. If we continue with the nuclear program in any way, shape or form, that is going to lock society

into that choice for a certain period of time. Even the nuclear industry itself admits that it is a limited-- it is only a limited period of time. It seems so much wiser to eliminate the need for expanding energy production by cutting back on waste and energy consumption. Those choices are capital-- are not capital intensive, but they are labour intensive. In other words, the alternatives to nuclear power will not feed highly technological industry initially, where capital investment is high and labour is low. It will feed low technological industries such as retro-fitting of all buildings in society to bring them up to rigid insulation standards and discovering new methods of conserving energy.

MR. BIRD: Do you feel that there would be no need to construct any kind of power generating facilities then?

MR. GOLD: I have a lot of faith in the ability of mankind to overcome this small hurdle in the grand march of civilization, and that is really all it is. Nuclear energy is a very dirty technology. The product is poisonous-- dangerous. The technology that is now available to us to handle it is not sufficiently sophisticated to ensure that society will remain free of the potential hazards that

are existent in it. If the inventiveness and the capital that will foster this inventiveness is turned away from nuclear power to other technologies, or to find and discover new technologies that will substitute for it, it will, in the long run and even in the short run, be much more beneficial to society than the continued production of nuclear.

MR. BIRD: Mr. Chairman, I think we could continue this discussion for some time, but I think perhaps we are off the topic, so perhaps I had better stop.

MR. DUNCAN: To go back to the more general topics we were talking about, information generation, information exchange and facilities for other groups to make assessments-- input into the process, sort of speak. The way you phrase your paragraph on the top of page two I think is a very acceptable way to do it. It says that "concerned citizens must have an equal voice with corporate structures when the shape of the future is being determined." You left it in that general form. This of course gets into the whole area of our existing social structure and the way people respond or the way they are capable of responding to these kinds of issues. I would like to hear from you a little more on the

kinds of opportunities which you would envisage as helping in those areas and what use would be made of the funds which you speak of and, also, what methods of education are we talking about and who should lead all this.

MR. GOLD: I believe that the basic principle of the right to information, though it does not have the same legal foundation in Canada as it does in the U.S., is still believed to be an essential part of the whole public process of self-government. I won't go so far as to say that this intricate flow of information of all kinds is a right. It should be. Yet, in situations like this it must be a privilege that is accorded to the people that are affected. The truth of the matter is that in this case everyone in society is going to be affected by the construction of a small nuclear installation on the shore of Lake Ontario at Port Granby because all Canadians have a stake in the nuclear industry. It is not a localized industry. It is a nationwide industry and it is growing in many different directions. The whole industry itself must be under scrutiny. All of the areas in which it is attempting to grow and expand must be under especially stringent surveillance, not only by people knowledgeable in the

industry itself, but by people who may be opposed to it for any reason whatsoever. Society owes itself that peace of mind, knowing that it has made every opportunity available for people to express themselves, no matter how ridiculous their opposition may seem to the bodies responsible for facilitating the information process.

MR. DUNCAN: My question really starts from there.

MR. GOLD: That was a preamble, I will now get to the answer. I think what I prefer to have as a consultant to answer this is a good advertising executive. I think the same principles that sold nuclear power can equally be applied to unsell nuclear power. That means massive exposure and information distribution on a large scale. The problem is not just Ontario. It is not just Ontario's problem or just Port Granby's problem. No one level of government is going to have sufficient resources to ensure that the necessary disbursal of information is taking place. If it means that mandatory courses in the environmental impact of nuclear installations have to be set up in high schools on a temporary basis, that would be a very useful step. I know that the Ontario Government runs a public information network

on television. I am sure they would be quite willing to provide a half hour or hour a week where a real live assessment panel can broadcast its hearings to the people of Ontario. There is no reason why television cameras could not have been set up in here in order to bring this process to the attention of the rest of the people in Ontario who have a stake in this.

I think eventually that public opposition and forces of economics will dictate the slowing down of the growth of the nuclear industry and its eventual abandonment as a viable method of powering society and providing the energy to society. But if we wait for the natural processes of history to ensure the abandonment of this undertaking, a lot of damage to the environment and to the Canadian economy is going to be done, and this process will change to what is basically a much cleaner and better mode of living can be accelerated quite a bit. If, primarily, it is realized that the changes taking place, recognize that it has to take place, that it cannot be avoided and secondly, if government corporate bureaucratic structures can put their weight behind the change to a better system, instead of trying to perpertuate a technology that has proven to be very, very expensive, beyond anyone's wildest imaginations and very hazardous.

MR. DUNCAN: Am I to read in that that there are mechanisms currently in existence for feedback that are acceptable to you, but it is the attitudes that may be held by bureaucrats and politicians that are the difficulty?

MR. GOLD: Yes. Somebody is setting up television programs. Somebody is publishing newspapers. The people responsible for controlling the avenues of information in society have not always been responsive to the opponents of nuclear power or open to their side of the story.

MR. DUNCAN: That all sounds to me that there is still a problem of getting information back in. That is what we are trying to get at. We are trying to get from you other mechanisms that you felt could overcome this. It appeared to be apparent that the existing methods were not satisfactory. But I am hearing that the existing methods appear to be satisfactory but we have an attitudinal problem. I would like to get around the attitudinal problem and back at the mechanisms because this is the kind of thing that we can feed back in. We cannot change people's attitudes overnight, but we can certainly try to see if we can do something about the mechanism.

Possibly you could pursue this, if

it is a topic that you would like to expound on in writing, and you could get back to us, that would be helpful.

MR. GOLD: Yes. I do not think I can add anything more at the present time that would really expand on what I said already.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think if you would like to pursue that in writing, we would be interested in hearing it, not only with respect to this panel, but the entire process of these types of hearings across Canada. I wonder if there are any questions from the floor of Mr. Gold's brief?

MR. PAUL MILLER: My name is Paul Miller. I am a citizen of this area. I live under the mushroom cloud of Eldorado.

Mr. Gold brought up some good points. I think most of the speakers here have brought up some very good points. I happen to be on the other side of the fence. I want to see this nuclear plant built. I do agree with all the speakers that we cannot be too careful about the seepage. There is no two ways about that. We cannot be too careful. On the other hand, Mr. Gold has said we should shut down all nuclear energy plants. That's fine. We are in a transition period now between fossil fuels, that we are

running out of very quickly, and going to some other fuel that we will have to find in the future in order to make our homes bearable. If we close down Pickering Nuclear Plant right now, how are we going to take three million people from Metro and put them in a place where they can get air and water. Everything we use is electricity oriented. Whether we like it or not, we are going into a stage where we are going to have to use things that are in some ways highly dangerous.

We have a plant standing at Pickering for fifteen years now. There were all kinds of calamities of woe and that was built. "It was going to blow up and kill millions of people in the surrounding area." I don't believe that there have been two people killed or hurt out of that plant since it has been built. I believe that has been monitored very carefully. I do not think Eldorado is going to set up a nuclear testing ground right in the middle of Northumberland County. Too many of them would lose their jobs over that, and a few other people, besides.

What I do believe is that we have to stop a lot of this stopping just out of fear. We could close every nuclear operation or every uranium mine in this country, and that uranium and that fuel

would still be coming from other parts of the world. I believe it was only this week that we had a cloud of radioactive waste come across from China. What should we do, put up great nets and say nobody cross us?

I agree with Mr. Gold in that we are standing on the threshold. We either go into a nuclear phase of energy, or we sit still.

Can we afford, first of all, a permanent birth control method where you say, "you have two children, and that's it." We have an army patrolling the border north, south, east and west, and we do not let a single soul come into this country. We would have to live with three quarters of a million unemployment. If this is the kind of future we are looking at, where we are not going to expand anywhere and the rest of the world will be going ahead. I do believe, and I say again, that I cannot state it too strongly--

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Miller, I would like to point out that the purpose of this phase of our hearings is to clarify what the speaker has said. If you would like to make a presentation, I am sure we can arrange that, or we can discuss this in the second phase of our hearings. We will hear the pros and cons to either proceeding with the project or

not.

MR. MILLER: I am sorry, sir, I did not mean to get into a debate.

THE CHAIRMAN: If you would like very quickly to cover a few more points, I would hear them. If you are going to be lengthy, perhaps we could schedule you some time later.

MR. MILLER: No, sir, I am only here for the day. Unfortunately, I can only afford the one day off.

As a construction worker, I have been all over North America in the last twenty-three years. I have worked in nuclear plants and uranium mines.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can I take it that you are now making a presentation, as such, perhaps based on what the previous and other speakers have said, which I am quite happy to accept. I just want to get some idea on how long you will be because--

MR. MILLER: Just about two minutes. I just wanted to say that somebody in this audience is in favour of this, for the jobs and for the future. I think we have to go ahead into a nuclear phase. Like I say, precautions have to be taken. That's all I would like to say, sir. Thank

you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I think in view of what you have said, we should perhaps ask you a few questions also. Perhaps we will finish with Mr. Gold first, and ask you to come up where he is so that you may answer them.

Are there any other questions on what Mr. Gold said?

PEGGY CLARK: We were talking about information disbursal, and you were asking about the ways to get people educated. I have a question based on this environmental assessment review process. The question I have to ask involves information disbursal. Is this relevant?

THE CHAIRMAN: The questions are relevant. The answers may not always be.

MISS CLARK: There were a couple of things that suggested to me that there was some information withholding during the review process. My question is, is there any stage in the environmental assessment regulations at which information can be withheld from the public? Perhaps I did not understand?

THE CHAIRMAN: As I said in my opening remarks a few nights ago, we are not a legally

enshrined process. You may be mixing this with the Ontario procedures. In principle, all of our information is available to the public. That does not mean that we open every one of our meetings and administrative gatherings and so on, but the result of those are made available, with the final reservation, as is with any other government report, the Minister of the Environment still has the right to decide not to release a final report to the public. We have never had that type of situation. The only time I can imagine it is if an item of national security were involved and something to do with national defence, perhaps. But basically everything that we do here is available to the public and we try to make the main points definitely available.

MISS CLARK: There is a sentence here. If they agree to accept the recommendations made by the panel, the report is released to the public. If they do not agree, then there is no report released?

THE CHAIRMAN: That is your conclusion.

MISS CLARK: Yes. That is what I am saying. Do I misunderstand?

THE CHAIRMAN: As I say, the final

decision rests with the minister. We have never had an occasion where it has not been made public. But in keeping with normal bureaucratic processes, that is still in the minister's prerogative to decide whether the report should be made public for whatever reason he chooses. I have cited a possible example.

MISS CLARK: So it is possible that information could be withheld.

THE CHAIRMAN: Not information in connection with these hearings; information in connection with our final report. That depends on the person to whom we give the report.

MISS CLARK: Do you have any idea what information can be classified as secret? How does he decide whether it can be released or not?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, I have no way of deciding whether he will decide what he wants to decide to do.

MISS CLARK: I was just wondering if he had any guidelines.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have the guidelines, I would hope, of common sense that you do not conduct these hearings in public for a few weeks now and a few weeks later and normally expect to say, "right, we are now going to have a secret report."

I don't think that's a very wise thing to do. As I said, there is a possibility in the case where it may involve national security and there may be many other reasons, and I am not precluding any other ones. But basically our report will be available, based on past performance. All of the previous reports have been made available to the public, and our office would be happy to give you copies of those.

MISS CLARK: Thank you.

MR. TOM FRASER: I am just starting to feel this thing out a little bit. I just wonder how many people -- or I would like to ask the question as to how we could go about reducing a three volume document containing technical terms and everything else to inform the general public about what is going on in nuclear power plants? How could we make that simpler? How could we break it down and make it simpler? I am asking that as a question, if Mr. Gold has anything to say on that.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am not proposing to answer on behalf of Eldorado, but there was a small abstract of twelve pages provided. Have you seen that, and have you any comment to make on that?

MR. FRASER: No. Like I say, I was just wondering-- I think that is partly the way

it has to go, to make it as clear as possible.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am sure that we or Eldorado would be happy to provide you with that.

MR. FRASER: I just want to say one more thing, then I will sit down because I am a little nervous. I think this situation is something to get nervous over. Basically, I wonder what is happening. We hear that Canada is always behind the United States a few steps and it is funny that we never learn any lessons from the United States or any other countries. They are beginning to shut down these plants. I understand there was a nuclear power plant shut down in Canada. So they are shutting down over here, and building over there. I just don't understand all that. Perhaps a member of Eldorado could help me out on that. Why should they shut down in one area and open in the other?

THE CHAIRMAN: That is the type of concern raised last night, I believe, and Eldorado did indicate that they would provide further information to us on the basis of the reason why they see the necessity for that plant. I think, Mr. Grant, that is still correct?

MR. GRANT: Yes. The necessity of the plant-- I do not know why they shut down here

and open there, if they do that in fact. But I will provide the information we offered.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any other comments?

MR. LANG: I would just like to ask, just very quickly, how many members you have in your organization?

MR. GOLD: Now we represent about a hundred.

MR. LANG: In this area.

MR. GOLD: Yes.

MR. LANG: Can you tell me very quickly what the objects of the organization are?

MR. GOLD: Basically the same as SEAP-Darlington, to prevent any damage to the environment from atomic pollution in any way, shape or form.

MR. GRANT: Did you say basically the same as SEAP-Darlington?

MR. GOLD: Sorry, that is us. Basically the same as the SEAP organization as a charter.

MR. GRANT: Does your organization have a charter?

MR. GOLD: No, we are affiliated

with them.

MR. GRANT: You are part of SEAP-SEAP. Is that what you mean?

MR. GOLD: Yes, as far as, you know, the common name is the same.

MR. GRANT: But what I am trying to find out-- I am not trying to be argumentative with you-- you mentioned that you have a hundred members. We heard yesterday or the first day from a lawyer representing SEAP that they have two hundred and fifty members. What I am trying to find out is are you saying that your chapter, or whatever it is, has a hundred over and above the two hundred and fifty of SEAP?

MR. GOLD: I don't know.

MR. VELDHUIS: Yes, that is exactly correct. The problem is twofold. This is a federal matter, and SEAP-Port Granby was formed to deal with the federal matter. After we became involved in this, another matter, a provincial matter, came about, and since we are all working people without, you know, time at our leisure, we decided that rather than trying to spread ourselves too thinly, a second chapter should be formed, which Mr. Gold is representing at this time. It deals strictly-- not stricly-- but it deals mainly

with the provincial problems, whereas ours deals with the federal problems, Eldorado being a federal corporation-- I'm sorry, a provincial Crown corporation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Any further questions of Mr. Gold?

MR. VELDHUIS: Supplementary, Mr. Chairman. Our organization has two hundred and fifty. That is our branch. Mr. Gold represents an additional hundred members from the Bowmanville area. Total three hundred and fifty.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I think we had that.

Any further questions?

MR. GRANT: This is not a question. It might be a bit of information that was sought a few minutes ago. Mr. Gold was wondering about the production in Ontario of electricity by nuclear energy. My information is the production figure is possibly eighteen percent at the present time.

MR. GOLD: Of electricity, but not total energy consumption.

MR. GRANT: No, I said production.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can you clarify whether you are questioning this speaker, or the next

speaker?

MR. QUENTIN BERGON: My name is Quentin Bergon. I am a resident of this area. I understand from reading local newspapers and what have you, I am as confused as the brother at the back here. I came down here the other night and stayed a short time and in this time SEAP stood up and made a public announcement that they were leaving the proceedings. I would like to ask the speaker, am I to believe that now SEAP has made a re-entry into the proceedings? May I have that clarified, please?

MR. GOLD: There are two different SEAPs.

MR. VELDHUIS: Mr. Chairman, may I clarify that, or try to clarify that?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think I would like to clarify it myself. I think the previous speaker made a valid point, and I think we were all here with your counsel when you personally decided to withdraw from the proceedings and, of course, you are here.

I think if we were a legal body and we had legal procedures, you probably would not be speaking quite so often. I view the purpose of this panel to receive information, and perceive that you have information and represent a group. On that basis, as I mentioned last night when you spoke as an individual but presented information drafted by SEAP, we accepted that because there is information in there. I tried to avoid a legalistic determination whether that is right or wrong. I viewed our mandate here to receive information and there was information there that we wanted to have.

MR. VELDHUIS: I just wanted to clarify, Mr. Chairman, the conditions under which we withdrew. It was simply until such time as funding was made available to us. It was not a complete withdrawal.

THE CHAIRMAN: It definitely is not a complete withdrawal.

Perhaps there may be some questions of Mr. Miller. Mr. Miller, would you perhaps like to share the table with Mr. Gold.

MR. MILLER: I am afraid I am not as much an expert in this field as Mr. Gold is, but I will try to answer the questions.

MS. DEROW: You seem to have had experience in this industry, and you are a local

resident. I am interested in your opinion about site selection and the relative degree of risk and relative appropriateness of building such a site here in Port Granby in view of what a lot of things have come up in the hearings.

MR. MILLER: I think I tried to explain this to you at the time. We can be scared of putting anything anywhere. A facility like this needs to be close to water for the heating and maintenance factor. I doubt that you would have any less risk say if you built -- well, if you built in a less populated area, naturally that would be safer. But if you do not have the conditions to build, there is no sense building it. The transmission of electricity from an unknown point would lead to greater costs. I think what people do not realize, and I agree with Mr. Gold that we are going into a different phase of operation. We can do one of either two things: stop dead where we are now and hope our energy lasts long enough and when our children are old enough they can go back to living in a tent. It is not a matter of walking away today and drilling a few more holes into the ground for oil. We are running out. We are running out of potential resources and we have to get back to resources that we can afford. I do not agree this is going to be one hundred percent for export. We are

going to have enough nuclear plants in our country to be using our own fuel. There will come a day when we will be able to re-use that waste. We will recycle and re-use it until we take about 99% out of the waste. That day is not long in coming.

If the first operations were cancelled because someone said that you can't do it because you will kill him, we would have been dead before we are 20.

A VOICE: Right on.

MR. MILLER: We can't sit talking all the time. We have to go ahead. Other countries are going ahead.

MS. DEROW: The point of clarification was site selection.

MR. MILLER: I am sorry. I got off the track. I don't believe it would be anymore harmful there than anyplace else. Has there been any seepage from Pickering?

MS. DEROW: It is quite a different establishment.

MR. MILLER: Yes, but I think, too, the supervision in this type of plant would be very, very great and very stringent. The monitoring systems you have in pollution control today are very, very effective.

MR. LANG: Both of you agree that you cannot be too careful. You believe that you can be careful enough.

MR. MILLER: I didn't say that. I agree you can't be too careful, but I think it is time we took a little bit of a chance. We can't sit on our butts here forever. Time is running out.

MR. LANG: We try to find out the interests of people coming before us. Your concern stems out of the feeling, I gather, that we really need to act now and the urgency justifies the risk?

MR. MILLER: I really do, sir.

MR. LANG: You also indicated that you work in this industry.

MR. MILLER: I am a construction worker.

MR. LANG: You have an interest -- or do you feel a concern about the employment and so on, not just from the plant, but the lack of it that might come if our energy needs are not met?

MR. MILLER: My personal gain might be two years of work close to home. On the other hand, I have never been out of work anytime that I wanted to in the last 22 years. What does concern me is that we are running out of useable fuels and we have to start looking ahead now, and not wait until we

run out and then wonder what we can do.

MR. LANG: I wanted to ask you this, this plant exports to the United States.

MR. MILLER: Right now. But like I say, we are going to be using that ourselves in the future. Pickering will not be the only nuclear plant. There will be nuclear plants in Bruce, British Columbia and Quebec. We will have to have them in the Maritimes before too long. People can say anything they like. I am not saying it is the safest method in the world. Nothing is really safe. People get killed crossing a road. I am just saying that it is time. This has been used before and done before, and we are getting more careful and more experienced in handling it.

Like I say, when they tried to build Pickering, how many years delay was caused to Pickering? Fifteen years later we have not had anything at all except for the waste, which concerns me also. I also have kids in this area. I also hope they will be living here for the next fifty or a hundred years or whatever.

There are a few of us, around eight or nine thousand tradesmen, getting fed-up in this area about people coming around and stopping everything that is being built in the name of progress. How long can we progress if we keep stopping everything?

I think it is a matter of time on this energy business. It is something that has to be done. If we start looking progressively at something, instead of negatively, we might get something done that is going to helpful to us. That is my only point.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Are there any other questions?

MR. BIRD: Mr. Miller, it has been explained to us very carefully during these hearings that the particular plant in question is being designed to produce a product which is intended solely for export; that the material being produced would not be converted to a fuel that could be used in Canadian designed reactors as they stand today. Does that in any way change the opinion you expressed a few minutes ago?

MR. MILLER: Like I say, today it is for export; tomorrow is a whole new day. It is like oil. We are going to come to a point where we will not be able to export any oil. I think uranium right now may be a factor in this oil we are importing right now.

MR. BIRD: Do you see a change in the design of the Canadian reactors or that the plant itself will be modified for fuel for Canadian reactors?

MR. MILLER: Like I say, sir,

I am not an expert in this field. It is just conjecture. I think we will be building more sophisticated kinds of reactors and Eldorado will be producing both types.

I would like to say one other thing. The Pickering nuclear plant is the most up-to-date and modern plant of its kind. It was built by Canadians for Canadians. We did not follow the United States on that one.

MR. CHENG: Mr. Miller, you mentioned about eight to nine thousand tradesmen.

MR. MILLER: Yes. Eight to nine thousand.

MR. CHENG: Are they all employed in this nuclear related work or in different trades?

MR. MILLER: In this area I would say we have maybe a thousand in it. That would be total trades combined.

MR. CHENG: What happens when all the construction for the proposed nuclear plant is done. Are all the workers going to come into this area?

MR. MILLER: I very much doubt it. We build motels and hotels like this. We work in industrial plants. You don 't have specialized people except when you get right into the running of it. Engineering would be more along the lines of specialists, than electricians, to a certain extent.

Electrical work is pretty well the same, no matter what type of plant you have. Engineering would make the difference, sir. If you can read a blueprint, you can do the job.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any further questions of Mr. Miller?

MR. VELDHUIS: I have a natural affinity with Mr. Miller because my whole family is in the building business and I know his concern. His concern is mainly with jobs. I have two questions. Number 1, is Mr. Miller going to prepare a brief. Perhaps he should answer the question first.

MR. MILLER: I did not give it any thought until today. I might like to put some of my ideas down on paper.

MR. VELDHUIS: Yes, I am sure we all would. I would also like to ask Mr. Miller if he intends to, in his brief, check into the job possibility of solar energy, wood alcohol, wind, water and wave energy, as in terms of our local manpower involvements in this, and whether he would also like to address himself to how many people or jobs would be aimed to replacing inefficient energy machines with more efficient ones and household appliances, etcetera. Also with re-insulation and upgrading of houses and retrofitting. In other words, what I am asking you to do on my behalf, perhaps, and perhaps it is a bit unfair,

is to check out some of those things to see whether or not they do not cancel out whatever jobs Port Granby would provide.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think Mr. Miller would be responsible for his own brief. I am sure he will consider your comments. However, they are the type of comments we might reserve for the second phase when the technical experts are here and can give a more definitive reply than Mr. Miller might be able to get as he tries to get his brief in order. However, I will leave that up to Mr. Miller.

MS. DEROW: I am confused about site selection. Mr. Gold said it should not be in a rural area. It should not be Lake Ontario. I guess it was a rural populated area. You said it should be as safe as possible, but we should proceed. We are trying to weigh a lot of factors. You have mentioned a lot of factors that we hope we can take into our written recommendation. Our concern, of course, is putting this altogether. If we are going to be as safe as possible and going to select perhaps the best site or reconsider site selection, where, as I was trying to get at before, do you really think would be the safest place?

MR. MILLER: I am afraid I am not a geologist.

MS. DEROW: We don't want

that. We want public opinion.

MR. MILLER: Well, I think the James Bay project is great, but then, on the other hand, if you look at it his way, a little bit of seepage up there would go a lot farther up in the artic than it would down here and we would not have the control and modern facilities we have down here to be able to counter-act that right off the bat.

I have lived on an off for twenty years within ten miles of Eldorado. The way we hear some people talk about Eldorado -- like I say, when I got up and made that crack about nobody appreciates living under the mushroom. It has not gone off yet. That is not to say it is not going to. It is the same as today, we are living in a peaceful state, that there is not going to be a war tomorrow. There are a lot of things we do not like to see happen. I don't like to see the environment going the way it is. I used to go deer hunting a hundred feet from my home. There are sub-divisions all around now. Those are the things that are happening. I can't stop it. I've tried that for a long time. It does not work. I think it is time that we all open our eyes a little bit and start looking ahead instead of looking back. It is a situation of six of one and half dozen of the other. I really believe that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Unless there are any further questions, we have two other speakers.

MRS. LAWSON: Mr. Miller, you talked a lot about progess -- it is time we opened our eyes and looked ahead. How do you define progress?

MR. MILLER: Well, we are living in an age where we have all of these modern facilities. I say it is either a matter of keeping up with the facilities we have and trying to conserve as much as we can-- which is almost impossible because there is so much waste -- that we would have to have a different order of society if we want to get back to basics. I think we have to go ahead with this basic nuclear. We have to have something as a stop gap between the time we get the proper solar energy in the future and fossil fuel based economy we are living under now. That is what I mean by progress.

MR. LAWSON: Progress means possessions -- material possession?

MR. MILLER: I think progress means living in the manner that we have become used to. You wouldn't like to move into a tent and have a flashlight in there when you are used to living in a four bedroom home with conveniences and perhaps a fireplace. That is progress. Or, you wouldn't want to go from a tent to a

hole in the ground. That is what I call progress. Going forward from the tent to the house, rather than going from the tent to the hole in the ground.

MRS. ELLIOT: I would like to follow on Mrs. Lawson's question. Mr. Miller, do you feel that Canadians should be asked to give up anything for the sake of conserving some of our resources and conserving energy?

MR. MILLER: If it was up to me, dear lady, I wouldn't ask them, I would make them do it. But, unfortunately, it is not up to me. For everyone that will do it, there is a hundred that won't. I think it is about time we get out of our ivory towers and start looking at facts in the way they are. You can't make people do things. We have to start looking ahead that way. That is what I mean. We progess, or we stop dead. We do not live under a dictatorship. We live under a democracy. Whether we like it or not, the way things are going, we will have to do things we don't want to. There are a lot of people who won't practice birth control. They are going to make it very hard for the people who do. These are the types of reasons we have to go ahead with this type of policy that we have now. It is not a perfect world. I didn't make it.

MRS. ELLIOT: You don't agree

with Mr. Gold that perhaps more public awareness of a need to conserve energy. You are saying that we need to have these plans for more energy. You do not believe that through public education programmes that Canadians are intelligent enough to accept the fact that we would need to conserve a little more than we are now and tighten our belts a little bit. I think Mr. Trudeau has been trying to say that for a while.

MR. MILLER: If I said what I think about the intelligence of the electorate, I do not think we would be sitting here very long. No, I do not believe people will conserve. A person believes his neighbour should conserve, but he doesn't have to. What I am saying, dear lady, unless you get a police state where you turn off your lights at a certain time, or whatever, that we are going to have to go into a more forward looking policy on energy and everything else. I'm afraid I do not disagree with Mr. Gold on the first part of your question.

THE CHAIRMAN: Excuse me. I think we are getting into an interesting debate, but I think of the debate is in the next phase.

MR. MILLER: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, I do believe in public education. You are absolutely right. But how many people would rather stay home right now and watch the baseball game, or hockey or football game. Look at this. There is

something very, very important going on here. You have less than 200 people sitting in the room out of 70,000. Does that show you where your public is? It cost me a $100.00 to take the day off to come up here to listen to these hearings. I think it was worth it. There were some good points brought up that I strongly agreed with. But I also think it is about time that somebody started talking about a few other things. I think the same people get to the same meetings most of the time to present their views. I think other people should make an attempt to get there too.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. CHENG: Excuse me. Would you mind coming back. I just wanted to ask about a point you talked about concerning site selection. One of the basic principles of your argument was that the refinery needs a lot of water. I would just like to raise the option to you that it doesn't really need the water a lot of the time or in all cases. There are alternatives such as tower cooling that might even create more jobs. I mentioned this so that when you are presenting your brief you might take this into consideration.

Mr. Miller: I appreciate that.

One thing I would like to say. In almost the same situation, I worked in a refinery out West and it was right on the Peace River, as a matter of

fact. They used water directly from the river. It went through the plant and came back out from the pollution control devices. That water was more pure when it came out than when it came in. On one side of the plant the water entered and on the other side of the plant they had trout ponds. I think when you get that kind of safety it is good. Any one of those streams could have been shut off within a seconds notice. These are the things to look at. I think there is a great worry about seepage running straight in. We have too much modern equipment and plugs to allow something like that to happen.

MR. CHENG: I am mentioning to you that there are options whereby you do not need to locate beside the water.

MR. MILLER: Yes, that could be.

THE CHAIRMAN: In order that at least the panel gets dinner, we had better move on to our next speaker.

Our next speaker is Marjorie Ashby.

MARJORIE ASHBY: Mr. Chairman, and members of the panel, I am Marjorie Dickenson Ashby. Most of the people present here have heard or read of the Eldorado Nuclear Welcome dump site and the pollution of the creek called Brand's Creek as a result of this dump.

M. Ashby

My reason for being especially interested in this case was because the creek flows through the farm owned by my Father, Carllus Dickinson, at that time, and presently farmed by my brother, Clarke Dickinson.

During the early 1950's fish were killed, the grass turned brown along the banks of the creek and the cattle were in a very poor condition, aborting their calves. This creek was their source of drinking water. Arsenic was present in the hair of the cattle. Letters were exchanged between my Father's lawyer Stuart Ryan, presently a Professor at Kingston University, and Eldorado's lawyer, Russell Honey, Judge Honey of Belleville, during 1956 and 1957. The question of pollution was brought before the House of Commons -- refer to Hansard, March 19, 1956.

Eldorado Nuclear never admitted that they were the cause of the contamination of this creek but they installed a pump and buried a pipe to carry off the leachate to flow into Lake Ontario. This has been allowed to continue for over twenty years.

As recently as the Spring of 1976, this run-off overflowed the banks at this site, caused wash-outs, flooded around homes, across gardens and entered the creek. A member of the A.E.C.B. said that the bank should be built up around the pond and a larger pump installed, and he was quite concerned about

M. Ashby

the spring bubbling up a yellow colour. Nothing has been done, to my knowledge. Eldorado promised to send reports on the condition of Brand's Creek to my Father in the 1950's and the member of the A.E.C.B. said he would report the result of samples taken in Spring of 1976, but their promises were never kept.

Individuals have made complaints regarding the Welcome site and the Port Granby site on many occasions. They were ignored. At Port Granby tanker trucks would arrive at 3:00 o'clock in the morning to dump their loads of liquid waste under cover of darkness. Fires would be started after regular working hours.

Eldorado personnel made this statement on Tuesday evening that the water was drinking water quality along the shores of Lake Ontario. If this is the case, why did Eldorado go to the expense of building a pump house, installing a pump and building lagoons? This does not make sense. I cannot help wondering how this pure water killed Mr. Budd Elliott's cows.

I have a newspaper clipping from the Globe and Mail, dated March 12, 1956, with the heading "Farmers Told Livestock Safe Near Dump."

William J. Bennett, president of Atomic Energy of Canada, said last night there is no danger from radiation or arsenical poisoning at a new waste dump es-

M. Ashby

tablished near Port Hope by Eldorado Mining and Refining Limited.

Mr. Bennett was commenting on the fears of Wesleyville district farmers who decided Saturday night to protest to Ottawa the action of the Crown-owned firm.

After talks with John M. James, Liberal member of Parliament for Durham, the 20 farmers decided to forward a protest and a list of questions to Ottawa.

Bennett said the dump was established on the Lake Ontario shore a few miles west of Port Hope, last June at the same time as a new refining process was put into use at Eldorado.

There is no hazard, he said, as the arsenic, under the new process, "will not go into solution. It can't drain into anyone's property and even if it did, it is non-soluble."

He said there "is no radioactive hazard and there never has been."

While no ill-effects have been reported from the dump, farmers say that an old one at nearby Port Britain spilled waste into Brands Creek, sterilizing cattle herds and killing fish and wildlife. The

firm refines uranium.

Bennett said the old dump, which had been in use for nine years, contained a small amount of arsenic. Some of this had leaked through to an underground stream and there was fear "of it showing up in wells on nearby farms.

He said his department worked closely with the Ontario Department of Health on this matter. When, during last year's dry summer, farmers claimed their cattle suffered as a result of something in the water "we gave them the benefit of the doubt and came to a settlement with them"

This, he said, was "better than going to court because you didn't know what kind of a decision you'll get." To his knowledge, no cattle died. "I think it was a question of losing weight."

No incidents have been reported at the new site, and no waste has been dumped at the old site since the new one was started.

Harold Berrowcloth of Wesleyville, said last night the new dump is right at the edge of the lake and the farmers are

afraid of what might happen with the spring run-off.

"We don't know and we want to know," he said. "Not just from the point-of-view of the farmer. There are a lot of cottages around here, too."

I also have another article, dated March 20th, 1956, headed Arsenic in Waste at Port Hope Eliminated: Howe

Trade Minister Howe said today that residue dumped by Eldorado Mining and Refining Ltd. at its uranium processing plant at Port Hope contains no radioactive or arsenic hazards.

Replying to a question by Howard Green (PC, Vancouver-Quadra), he told the Commons the residue has never contained radioactive materials. Up to 12 months ago it included an arsenic content but this had been eliminated by a new refining process.

The Port Hope plant of the Crown company produces uranium oxide which is shipped to the United States to be processed into uranium metal.

Mr. Howe said residue from the plant formerly was dumped in a fenced-off area.

Arsenic in the residue found its way into nearby streams and brought protests from farmers who said their livestock was affected.

A settlement had been made by Eldorado.

Mr. Howe said the old dumping area has not been used for the last twelve months. The residue now was being dumped in an area on the shore of Lake Ontario.

He said residents of the area are planning a protest meeting on alleged radio active and arsenic hazards in the residue. Last night Mr. Budd Elliott stated two of his cattle died of arsenic poisoning, so we know it was not eliminated by the "new refining process." The history of Port Hope Eldorado has been to pollute one area and then move on to another site.

The members of SEAP and other people brought to the attention of the public what has been allowed to take place at Port Granby over the years. Scientists and technicians do not know the answers to this waste problem, do not know what to do with radio active wastes. The problem exists all over the world. We must put a halt to all nuclear plants and refineries until scientists and governments can give the people an answer in which we can have some faith.

M. Ashby

Let them prove to the people of this area, the province and Canada that they know what they are doing, for I certainly think their present day methods are useless. Today they are polluting the air, the water and the land.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions from the panel?

MS. DEROW: I was intrigued earlier when you said tanker trucks arrived at 3:00 a.m. in the morning to dump wastes. Do you know they were dumping wastes?

MRS. ASHBY: Dumping liquid wastes.

MS. DEROW: Does Eldorado have anything to say on this?

MR. GRANT: As you seem to be reasonably well informed on the Eldorado activities, you probably know that Eldorado operates twenty-four hours a day, and it is therefore necessary to dispose of residue on a twenty-four hour basis. I think, however, if you think of the proposal with respect to Port Granby, you will realize that the disposition of residue, even if it were carried on a twenty-four hour a day basis, would not disturb neighbours, as it perhaps has disturbed you, as it is entirely within the boundaries of the property.

There is one thing I might just mention. I think it is a factual correction. Mrs. Ashby stated that the cows of which we heard yesterday died of arsenic poisoning. In fact his evidence was, and the fact is, that the cows died of nitric poisoning, and the cows were not near the residue area. They were in fact on the residue area. They somehow had broken through a security fence.

MRS. ASHBY: I beg to differ with you,sir. He was asked if there were any other occasions, and the first two cows that he lost died from arsenic poisoning.

MR. GRANT: But that was not in 1974.

MRS. ASHBY: I did not give any dates.

MS. DEROW: Some of the dates were a little difficult to follow. I am interested in the spring bubbling up yellow colour. When was that?

MRS. ASHBY: It goes on at the Welcome site.

MS. DEROW: People drink that water?

MRS. ASHBY: No, there is a sign that says it is not safe for drinking.

MS. DEROW: What about these

M. Ashby

fires you were referring to?

MRS. ASHBY: I saw those with my own eyes.

MS. DEROW: What significance do they have?

MRS. ASHBY: Well, are they privileged to start fires with black smoke rolling up from the site?

THE CHAIRMAN: Perhaps Eldorado might wish to clarify the fires.

MR. GRANT: We are just as mystified as this lady is about the fires. We are certainly not aware of the fires. If she is suggesting that we were doing something clandestine to dispose of things that we did not want to talk about, I think that is an unfair suggestion.

THE CHAIRMAN: Could you tell us whether these fires were recent, still continuing or what time frame it was when you saw them, and clarify for me which dump?

MRS. ASHBY: At Port Granby dump, and I saw them, and I called Alex Carruthers, my MPP, regarding them, and he wanted to make sure that it wasn't just steam, and I thought I could tell the difference between steam and black smoke.

M. Ashby

THE CHAIRMAN: What time frame was this? This year, ten years ago?

MRS. ASHBY: No, three - probably three years ago.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is this continuing?

MRS. ASHBY: No, I have no word of it recently.

MS. DEROW: I am very interested in community health. I do not think I made myself clear yesterday about occupational health matters as related to the community. With such things happening in your immediate surroundings, you must be very concerned for yourself -- cows aborting and cows dieing in this sort of thing. Have the people been concerned enough to have themselves checked over for special poisoning or special consideration healthwise? There are monitoring facilities for those people who do work within the facility, and we are definitely concerned about community health. I wonder, have you been concerned to that extent?

MRS. ASHBY: We have had the water resources check the Brands Creek on our own, but we never got any cooperation from Eldorado for any of the monitoring they were supposed to have done.

MS. DEROW: I was referring to your own physical self with regard to check-ups and things

of this nature.

MRS. ASHBY: Nothing has ever been suggested to us.

MS. DEROW: I was just wondering. Another topic of interest is the communication between Eldorado and the community. You mentioned on two occasions there seems to have been some problem of communication. One was about Eldorado replying to your Father. That was a long time ago. The A.C.D was going to give you some information, and they did not. This is probably a question for Eldorado. Did you have knowledge or do you have knowledge of problems to communicate with the community? Do you set up some sort of way of communicating to local residents when they do have these sorts of concerns, to alleviate possible problems?

MR. GRANT: We try to do that. I think we have a pretty good track record in Port Hope where our principal activity is carried on. It can get a little difficult in sparsely populated communities such as in the area where the residue is located. It becomes more difficult since we did not, until very recently, have people regularly on the residue site. Now with the construction of the water treatment facility, we do have people much more regularly, so if there are problems which emanate or are based on our activities

M. Ashby

at that location, we hope we will be able to hear about them more readily.

The difficulty is that some people are a little alarmist about these things and we have to deal with accusations which are well beyond anything which is rational. Our attitude is that it is difficult to deal with an irrational accusation, so we just don't deal with them.

MS. DEROW: This is very difficult. I wonder if there are plans in the future for developing more harmonious relationships with communities.

MR. GRANT: Absolutely. In connection with this very proposal we have established in this community itself information centers. We have had representatives from Eldorado going around trying to demonstrate to the public graphically, orally and verbally what it is we propose to do, what we assessed the impact will be on the environment. We have done public attitudinal surveys. We filed with the panel a copy of that public opinion pole survey. We left at the back of the room summaries of that material. It is a very difficult position, because the more we do that, the more we get accused by certain elements of spending vast sums of money on propaganda. That is what the newspapers do, and that is what the SEAP group

M. Ashby

says. We are endeavouring to ignore that. We are trying to establish a meaningful line of communication with the community, and we certainly will continue to do so if we are successful in having our application for the construction of the refinery approved. We already have been in communication with people who are interested in having us assist them in certain local sports charitable activities, in which we are quite interested.

MS. DEROW: I am talking about what you consider to be alarmist fears and this sort of thing.

MR. GRANT: We deal with the fears. If anybody asks these questions, we deal with them. The difficulty is that we give them the answer -- for example, with respect to this question of Brands Creek. Stan Frost, who is a Nuclear Physicist, in fact examined that creek himself in March of 1976. Mr. Frost is very learned in this area, and it was his professional conclusion that the quality of water in the creek met substantially and exceeded Ontario drinking water standards. I don't know what this lady is referring to about yellow liquids coming out of the water. If that was a problem and concern to her and she thought it was something for which we were in any way responsible, I would hope that she would have communicated with us. I don't know if she did. I do know that when we heard

M. Ashby

of the concern of Brands Creek, Mr. Frost went there and examined it personally. If you want to know precisely the results, he can give the results.

MS. DEROW: It might be good to have before us.

MRS. ASHBY: Mr. Frost never reported back to our family.

MR. GRANT: But Mr. Frost was not asked to. I think you approached the Atomic Energy Control Board -- did you say that?

MS. DEROW: That is the most recent issue, I think. There are two issues to which she is referring to.

MR. SHIKAZE: The only comment I would have is that Mrs. Ashby made reference to a number of documents back in 1956 which may have some relevance in terms of our review and I would appreciate it if they were made available to us.

THE CHAIRMAN: I might add that we would appreciate your brief, also.

MR. BIRD: I would like to inquire a little bit more about your knowledge about the actual plan for the new refinery. When did you first become aware of the proposal to build the uranium refinery at the Port Granby site?

MRS. ASHBY: I imagine when

everyone else did. It was mentioned in the newspapers and sent out.

MR. BIRD: You received a letter directly from Eldorado?

MRS. ASHBY: Yes.

MR. BIRD: Eldorado has been telling us, among other efforts that they have made to inform the public, that they have established a public information center in Port Hope and there is another one here in Bowmanville I believe. Have you visited either of these centers to try to find out more about the current planning for this facility?

MRS. ASHBY: No, because I do not have any faith in the company.

MR. BIRD: Do you have any views at all about the necessity or desirability for such a plant, regardless of whether it was Eldorado who was going to build it? What is your view with respect to the need to have a Canadian producer for UF 6? Do you have any views on that?

MRS. ASHBY: I am against the waste disposal site especially because of problems they create. But I am not in favour of the refinery either.

MR. BIRD: Does your concern go on to encompass the entire field of nuclear energy, nuclear power? Are you against nuclear power as well?

MRS. ASHBY: Not as strongly.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any questions from the floor?

MR. VELDHUIS: Mr. Grant mentioned something about the irrational alarmist statements by groups such as the press and SEAP. Could he perhaps give us some idea of what he means by that because it was rather vague.

MR. GRANT: Yes, as a matter of fact I can give you a very precise answer to it. Your Darlington Chapter stated in its report today, in it endeavour to find a solution to these great problems that it is concerned with, that government, which is adequately represented on the panel, industry and public utilities "distrustful and disdainful of the collective wisdom of the people, have spent millions promoting nuclear power." That kind of statement does not advance or endeavour to understand things.

THE CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, before we get into a debate about whether it is or is not, obviously anybody is free to draw whatever conclusions they want from whatever statements are made. Whether or not those statements are alarmist, we will have to draw our own conclusions.

Do you have another question, Mr. Veldhuis?

M. Ashby

MR. VELDHUIS: Is that the only thing he is concerned about?

THE CHAIRMAN: You mean is that the only example?

MR. VELDHUIS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't think, in terms of clarifying what Mrs. Ashby has said, which is the purpose here, that we have to get into a debate about whether or not it is an alarmist statement.

MR. VELDHUIS: Mr. Chairman, if I may, I think what I am trying to get at is Mr. Grant is, I think, trying to undermine the credibility of Mrs. Ashby. In doing so he is saying she belongs to that global group of people who are alarmists, and I am trying to find out just what does he mean by that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Veldhuis, I am sure Mr. Grant is very skilled in how to check the credibility of witnesses. I think if you want to engage in that, then all of the other people can, and there has been a fair amount of latitude on both sides of this on statements about how good and how bad Eldorado is. I think a little bit is fair on the other side, and I would prefer not to get into it in detail.

MR. GRANT: Mr. Chairman, could I interrupt for half a minute. I don't mean, and if I have said so, I apologize to Mrs. Ashby. I did

M. Ashby

not intend to attack her credibility, nor to question her honesty and truthfulness in things that she has seen. I am not going to do that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Grant.

MR. JOHN GIMBLETT: Mrs. Ashby, would it be an imposition for you to attend this evening to possibly answer some questions. Unfortunately Mr. Laird, our legal counsel, was not able to make the hearings this afternoon. I think possibly your statements may be very interresting to him, not only in conjunction with this hearing, but any other parallel action the adjacent property owners may take.

I think one other thing -- Ernie Webster was to speak this afternoon. He was a resident of Port Granby when the original dump site went in. Unfortunately, he had to milk at 4:00 o'clock, so he is not here. He will be back tonight, and he can possibly supplement what Mrs. Ashby has said.

One other thing that Mr. Laird could possibly bring up tonight is Mr. Grant's supposition that the cattle mysteriously ended up on the residue site. I don't know what that means or whether any innuendo is meant, but we have tried to stay away from innuendo.

I hope Mr. Laird will be allowed

M. Ashby

the right to ask Mrs. Ashby some questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am not clear on whether you wish to speak to Mrs. Ashby privately in terms of a later brief that you wish to present, or do you wish to question her further in public?

MR. GIMBLETT: In public; only I am sure Mr. Laird would like to have that opportunity this evening.

THE CHAIRMAN: I guess we will have to leave that up to Mrs. Ashby. I will try to schedule her after the other speakers this evening if she wishes to be present.

MR. GIMBLETT: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you Mrs. Ashby. Perhaps we will see you this evening.

Our last speaker is Gwen Best, a resident of Port Hope.

MRS. GWEN BEST: First of all, I am not a resident of Port Hope. R.R. 3 Port Hope, which is four or five miles west of Port Hope.

Most of my presentation consists of a quote from an article written by Mary Hays Weik for publication. It is entitled, "Radioactive Wastes -- an unsolved Problem."

One day in the summer of 1964, in a small town just across the Hudson River from New York-

Nutley, New Jersey - two boys playing in a nearby pond made a curious find in a colony of frogs, most of which had five to eight legs. When the strange frogs began to turn up in local pet shops and museums, disturbing questions were asked.

It developed then that certain local industries had for years been dumping unhealthy wastes into a creek emptying into the Nutley pond. The frogs' mutations reported the New York Times, were attributed by the curator of reptiles at the New York Museum of Natural History to local deposits in the pond.

In Canada, a few months later, the Toronto Globe and Mail disclosed alarming conditions at Elliott Lake, the model town founded some years ago in the vast uranium fields of eastern Ontario, the richest in the world. For several years, local plants processing the districts uranium ore had been dumping their 'tailings' into the two lakes from which the town derives its water supply An investigation by a local citizen disclosed radioactive pollution at disturbing levels in the water which thousands of the workers and their families had been drinking for years.

Health Record:

It was after several such incidents that

I decided to make a direct study of the health records of residents in such localities. In the case of the frogs, I knew of more than a hundred factories and laboratories in that industrial section of New Jersey, licenced to use nuclear materials of various kinds in their operations. And wherever there are nuclear industries, power plants or laboratories, there are always nuclear wastes to dispose of and worry about. For this is the number one problem of atomic development - its spreading contamination of our natural environment.

It is no wonder that camera shots of atomic plants make a pretty picture situated, as such plants usually are, beside a picturesque river or lake. For next to atomic fuel, the most pressing need of these plants is water- enormous quantities of it, close at hand - as a coolant for many types of atomic reactors, and to receive and carry away their'low-level' radioactive wastes. This is atomic energy's greatest potential for disaster. For the quantities of water that go into such plants, anywhere in the world, must eventually go out, carrying their own inevitable contamination, however carefully controlled; plus the added

G. Best

burden of expelled floods of low-level liquid wastes.

What becomes of these wastes - called 'harmless' by the plants owners, but in fact found concentrated as much as ten thousand times in the plant and animal life of the rivers and creeks they enter, as far as 150 miles downstream- some of their potent isotopes lasting hundreds and even thousands of years? Do they reach out into surrounding soil; enter other streams, rivers, irrigation systems; drain into nearby seas and oceans; penetrate underground water-tables, that supply woodland springs and household wells; enter the vegetation that animals and humans eat, the drinking water they must use? Biggest question of all: what actual physical effects are they having on our population especially the people living fairly close to such plants? What do their health records show?

That is what I determined to find out. The project that I set up was to take a group of the older and larger U.S. atomic plants and test sites - since a space of years is naturally required to show any noticeable effects on local mortality figures (in Hiroshima, leukemia increase began a year and a half after the bombing) - and find out, from actual published U.S. Health Statistics

for the areas concerned whether certain fatal defects and diseases commonly associated with radiation injury - death from birth defects, miscarriages, leukemia and other cancers exist to any unusual extent in the vicinity of the sites.

Mortality Rate

What I found far exceeded my fears. Mortality rates in this group, near atomic power plants and clusters of nuclear industries, ran consistently far above national rates. In areas around atomic installations, downstream along rivers that received their 'low-level' wastes incidence of such disease ran sometimes as high as three to five times the U.S. rate.

The Elliott Lake, Ontario, disclosures led to a wave of protest in Canada. "Any radioactivity in drinking water may be highly dangerous" wrote the editor of Canada's leading magazine, Macleans, especially for children whose bones are being formed. We shall not know for sure until the children have grown older, and we know how many have died in middle age of leukemia. The magazine charged "Our governments are not policing the situation as they should, are not using what knowledge they do have to protect or warn us of the dangers --- Too many industrial enterprises --

G. Best

behave as if they had a right to pollute our waters at will, and as if anything they do to reduce pollution is a gracious good-will gesture. It is for them to show cause why they should ever have been allowed to foul our water in the first place, and why they should not be compelled to stop doing it anymore.

Little official notice is taken of such conditions, no government reports to its citizens on the mounting radioactive content of their drinking water and food.

Why do such facts hardly ever reach the public? In countries like United States, Canada, Great Britain, France, India and in a growing number of smaller countries embarked on nuclear development. In these one can point to the profit motive, to the trustees of atomic industries, who also sit on the board of the nations' most powerful banks, insurance companies, real estate interests, investment groups, deeply involved in uranium mining and nuclear development - who are also the countries biggest money-lenders to whom city, state and national governments must look to market their bonds for day to day financing. One

can understand then why so little is ever done, at any level of government to oppose these wasteful and dangerous projects - why nuclear ships are allowed to dock in our harbours, and how nuclear wastes can be secretly trucked through our streets at night, without a word of protest from our higherups.

But how about socialist countries of nuclear development. There is no such motivation of private profit there. Yet there too, the same disregard is shown for their citizens health and lives the same nuclear wastes are spread through their waterways, air and soil, with the same senseless distruction of their natural resources.

Let us put the guilt where it belongs: with man himself - his hunger for prestige and power, and the apathy most of us show in the face of what is so shockingly called progress. I have little respect for those who throw up their hands and say, There is nothing we can do! Atomic energy is here - we must learn to live with it. There is a great deal we can do! We have the power and right in every country as citizens to demand the retirement of atomic energy

from use, as too destructive to public health and safety, to call for convertion of nuclear plants to other less harmful sources of power, coal, oil, gas etc. With the development of solar and other promising forms of energy involving no such dangerous element as fissionable uranium. The decision is ours to make! For the sake of all the worlds' children let us end this nightmare now.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mrs. Best.

MS. DEROW: I think that is an excellent presentation. I would like to thank you for bringing up a number of your concerns in this way. I wonder if you know of any community health measures being taken in this area in regard to infant mortality rates and certain kinds of diseases which would support some of the comments made in that article?

MRS. BEST: Would you repeat that question, please?

MS. DEROW: I wonder if you know of any studies being done here, any Doctors interested in some of the concerns you are talking about, that you have been reading about to us? Is anybody interested in community health, collecting these measures say within

G. Best

a radius of different nuclear installations around here?

MRS. BEST: Well, I think we are ready for it, but our professional people don't seem to be.

MS. DEROW: Could we ask Eldorado about any studies or health measures being taken in the general populous?

MR. GRANT: Yes, we have some information on that. It will take Mr. Frost a minute to actually find it, or he can just mention it briefly.

MR. FROST: This would be late 1975 or early 1976 when there was considerable upset among the public in Port Hope concerning radiation hazards. Dr. Gahn Muller, who was then with the Ontario Ministry of Health and is now with the Ontario Ministry of Labour, Occupational Health Branch, I believe, examined the Port Hope Public Health records, causes of death and incidents of malignancies, I guess, back to 1960, so he looked at the 13 or 14 years of statistics at that time and compared incidences of both individual types of malignancies and general cardio vascular diseases and other causes of death, and malagnancies over all, and he found no difference between the Port Hope records and those that he expected from the rest of the Province of Ontario. Because the numbers are small -- you are dealing only with a count of about 9,000 people --

if you look at individual causes of death you might find in one case there might be two more heart attacks or one less lung cancer and this sort of thing, so there are variations, very definitely, but when you do a statistical test for a significance, the numbers do not vary significantly from the rest of the province.

MS. DEROW: We did discuss inside factory walls occupational health measures. I was wondering if there have been any considerations for testing individuals immediately surrounding your facilities in regard to all of these allegations about arsenic levels, for example?

MR. FROST: I know of no such studies having been done.

MS. DEROW: We are dealing with a small population.

MR. FROST: I was going to say the immediate population would be extremely small.

MS. DEROW: We are of course very concerned about those people.

MR. FROST: I don't know what you would learn, unless it were sort of epidemic proportions, there would be no significance to whatever results you got.

MS. DEROW: If you have a population of ten and ten people show significantly --

MR. FROST: I don't think any public health problems to that extent have showed up. I would think that Doctor Muller's numbers were probably small enough that if there were two or three extra cases, they would have had effect on the statistics.

MS. DEROW: Was Doctor Muller working for you, or for the Ontario Ministry at the time?

MR. FROST: At that time he was employed by the Ontario Ministry of Health, and of course they are interested in these problems. They were taking an active part in an examination of the problem in Port Hope and he did that quite independently.

MS. DEROW: In the future there are going to be more nuclear facilities in this area. Are there any plans and projections made about probability of increasing risks to large population because the population is increasing as well?

MR. GRANT: Risks from --

MS. DEROW: The low level radiation that may be emitted from certain facilities.

MR. GRANT: This question may fall on the Health and Welfare paper dealing with the combined impact of various things. We would like to deal with that question as we outlined once before. To deal with it in a superficial way could be misleading.

MS. DEROW: Fine, but you

are going to consider this, and especially the community health aspect?

MR. GRANT: I am not sure I understand the distinction between community health and what we propose to do in terms of the radiological and environmental aspect . If that is what you mean, we will deal with it.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would just like to clarify from the Ontario government representatives that are here, I presume we can obtain a copy of this Doctor Muller's report from you?

MRS. BEVERLEY THORPE: I will certainly try and get the reports. I don't know of any reason why they would not be available. I will obviously have to check and we will get together all the information I can bring, and present that on October 5th, when the Province will be before the panel again.

MR. SCOTT: I would like to address this to Mr. Frost. Was that survey done only on potential radiological contamination or was any hair arsenic levels done at the same time?

MR. FROST: This was not a physical examination of the people in Port Hope. This was an examination of death certificates and I am not sure on how much he went into hospital records or anything. But it was that sort of study. It wasn't a

physical examination.

MR. SCOTT: It was basically the hospital records that I was wondering about -- whether there had been in hospitalization any examination in that light such as arsenic levels in hair. It was one of the standard tests that is now used.

MR. FROST: Not that I know of.

MR. BIRD: I would like to ask Mrs. Best a further explanation about the article she was reading. Could you tell us a bit more about the person who wrote the article? Was he a scientist, or an author who was concerned? What are her qualifications, so I can have a better understanding of her background.

MRS. BEST: I am not really prepared to answer that.

MR. BIRD: You don't know the answer to it?

MRS. BEST: That's right.

MR. BIRD: What publication were you reading from?

MRS. BEST: It was an article given me to read.

MR. BIRD: Can you tell me what it came out of; what Journal or what sort of publication is it?

MRS. BEST: I don't see that that question is relevant to the subject at hand.

MR. BIRD: I am sorry. I am trying to find out a little bit more so I can substantiate some of the statements that are made. For example, you talked about the mortality rate. I would be very interested to know whether there were control samples, populations that were studied at the same time. I would like to know more about the scientific basis of the study. You mentioned also in there reference, I believe, and I would like to ask this as a question, that governments had not published any information about levels of radioactivity in air, water or food. Did I note that correctly? Is that one of the statements in there?

MRS. BEST: I believe so.

MR. BIRD: Have you been aware of the publications that have been made about just those kind of factors by governments ever since the atomic weapons testing programme? There have been publications issued regularly on all of those subjects, including measurements of radioactivity in human beings. I find at the moment when I hear statements of that kind, and I know for a fact that there are errors in them, it casts some doubt on the rest of the statement, and I am trying to justify the authenticity of the material that you have read.

MRS. BEST: Where have these publications been made public?

MR. BIRD: Through the Department of National Health and Welfare, for one. The Ontario government reports as well.

MRS. BEST: Does the public have to inquire in order to get this information?

MR. BIRD: They were published and there was press coverage. There was a tremendous amount of information that was released. If you wanted an individual copy, certainly, you would have to make a request. There were public documents that were released on a regular basis and reported very extensively in the press. You cannot tell me anymore about this particular study that you are reporting from?

MRS. BEST: No, I really can't.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I was just going to say that I believe that excerpt is out of a book called "The Silent Spring." I believe that is one of the excerpts from that book by Rachel Carson.

What I wanted to ask, and I think this is very relevant, has anybody ever thought to study the mortality rate and age wise in a coal mining district, compared to an atomic fuel capacitor like Eldorado? I think you will find the mortality rates are about three or four times as high. These

could be taken from 1956 back to the present.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is this a clarification or another comment.

MR. MILLER: I think this is one thing I want to get in because this has been reported so many times tonight, Mr. Chairman, that I think that somebody who grew up in one of these areas could tell you what it was like. That is why I am not worried about these things, when I have seen what it could be like.

MR. FRASER: Mr. Chairman, I don't know who I should direct this question to, but the question just came to my mind when the lady was talking about contamination of the two lakes -- the water supply of Elliott Lake. The question I have is would it be possible through natural process for some of this radio-active material to escape into these lakes without the area being mined. Is it possible that there could be, and this is not meant as a pun, some seepage into the lakes by natural --

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that is a question -- are you interested in answering it, Doctor Bird, or would you prefer to wait until the second phase. It is a generally technical question and I think we would prefer to have the technical experts here at the technical phase and you could bring the question up again. I am sure in connection with seepage

that might occur -- again there is no pun intended -- that at the proposed residual site the same type of question will come up whether you are here or not.

MR. GRANT: Mr. Frost does have some information, if you are interested.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, if it won't take too long.

MR. FROST: Very quickly, I happen to have a copy of a report with me. It is an Atomic Energy Canada Publication, No. 3687. It is entitled, "Radium 226 content of water in the Chalk River area. In the back he does give some tables indicating radium content of various bodies of water and sources of drinking water world-wide and in North America. There is a tremendous range of numbers here. He has drinking water sources -- and these are supposedly uncontaminated or presumably naturally contaminated. But he has drinking water sources that range from 0.01 pico-curies per litre up to 37 pico-curies per litre of radium. The 37 is in Illinois. He lists 24.1 as another U.S. water supply. 18.4 for wells in Germany. These are to be compared with the current Ontario drinking water standard of 3 pico-curies per litre. He also lists radium levels in a number of ground water sources, wells and springs, and there is a tremendous range here, from less than .1 pico-curies per litre up to a maximum of 237,800 pico-curies per litre. To

answer this gentleman's question, yes, it is possible to have water contaminated naturally.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Are there any further questions of Mrs. Best?

If not, in view of the time, if there is someone who would like to make a presentation and cannot be here this evening, we would be prepared to hear them, otherwise we will schedule them first this evening if that would be satisfactory.

MISS PEGGY CLARK: May I just make a request, please. This thing about comparing deaths in the coal industry -- deaths in the coal industry are not relevant. The coal industry is not clean or not well run. There is great room for improvement there. The faults of one industry do not justify the faults of another. I would like to request improper comparisons like this not be made anymore in these hearings.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. GIMBLETT: Mr. Chairman, I have a hundred and one questions, but up at the Bowmanville Public Information Center, Eldorado has an awfully nice table model that they have seen fit to produce. I was wondering if possibly, if not tonight, maybe next week in Newcastle, if that table model could actually be moved down. We have so many interested people under one roof, that we may have a look at that

here for those who may not have the time or desire to go up and see it at the Center.

MR. GRANT: I have some suspicion that Mr. Gimblett wants this for some devious purpose. I will agree to bring the model down next week. It would be inconvenient to get it here tonight. It is fairly substantial. But we will certainly bring it down. It is to be shown here, to be shown everywhere. I am just intrigued as to why he wants it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Perhaps you could discuss the deviousness over dinner and we will resume at 7:00 o'clock tonight.

--- The panel adjourned.

Nethercut & Co. Ltd.
Toronto, Ontario

Bowmanville, Ontario,
September 29th, 1977

--- UPON COMMENCING AT 7:00 P.M.

THE CHAIRMAN: Good evening once again to most of you. We are here for the final stage of our Hearings on the first phase in Bowmanville. I usually start off with a small presentation of what we are doing. I wonder if I could have a quick show of hands of how many people who have heard it? Let me try again. How many have not heard it? There are a few new faces. I think I better quickly give a resume of what we are here for and what we will be doing this evening and in the future.

Our purpose is to prepare a report to the Minister of the Environment of the Federal Government. In our report we are to make recommendations with respect to the potential and environmental impact of the proposed Port Granby project, and also, to make recommendations on what measures should be taken to mitigate any environmental impact that may occur. There is considerable scope in our report to cover those items that we feel should be covered, and to determine whether, in our opinion, the project should go as stated, go with modifications or not go at all because of the potential and environmental impact. Now, this first phase of our Hearings are planned to accomplish three

purposes: firstly, it is to clarify points that may not be understood; secondly, to identify possible deficiencies in the environmental impact statement; thirdly, to identify concerns that the public may have about the project. Following this phase, the panel will determine the deficiencies in the EIS which require rectification and also identify issues which become the subject of our second phase Hearings.

The second phase Hearings will commence after the deficiencies have been corrected or rectified and made available for study. We will, of course, make this information public. The second phase Hearings then are on an issue basis with specific topics on specific days so that the technical experts can be present as well as those members of the public who are interested in specific subjects.

We have already asked the provincial and federal agencies to carry out technical reviews, and these have been presented to the panel-- or will be next week. Copies of these are available if anyone is interested and does not have them. Also briefs that have been presented to us already are available, as well, as some written submissions that we've received from individuals or organizations that do not plan to present oral briefs here.

Our procedures for these Hearings are to ask that each intervenor limit their remarks to about fifteen minutes or less, and then, to follow with a question period from the panel and the floor to clarify any remarks that the speaker has made. I would like to emphasize that we would like the questions to be directed at clarifying what the individual speaker has said, not to start a debate, or present a conflicting point of view, which is the purpose of our second phase Hearings when the technical speakers are here to shed light on the items that come up. I also should advise you that Eldorado has received a number of questions as a result of earlier briefs. They have indicated they are in the process of answering these and will continue to do so as soon as possible. We, also as a panel, want to leave time for questioning next Thursday evening in Newcastle of any items or areas which do not come up in the course of these Hearings.

In connection with that, we also intend to schedule an extra session next Thursday. Our Hearings in Newcastle will commence Tuesday evening at 7:00 p.m. in the community hall, Wednesday at 1:30 to 5:00 and 7:00 to 10:00, and Thursday at 10:00 a.m. to 12:00, 1:30 to 5:00 and 7:00 to 10:00. At the

end of each day's session, or half day's session, if time permits, we welcome individual briefs of anyone who wish to make informal or less formal basis. If you wish to please advise Mr. Brian Timmermans in advance so then we can schedule them as they come. He is on the right front.

At the present time we have basically five speakers on our agenda. The order-- although there is a qualification with the first one which I will explain, Marjorie Ashby-- there is Tony McQuail, a resident of Lucknow; Bill Borger for PANDA; Ian Connerty for Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility; and Chris Beatty.

I would like to introduce our panel members. I might introduce myself, my name is John Klenavic, Chairman of the panel. On my left-- your left and my right is Ellan Derow; Clement Cheng; Peter Bird; and at the far end is Reg Lang. Starting from the far end of the table on my left, your right is Kim Shikaze; Murray Duncan; David Scott. The gentleman to my immediate left is Michael Warder who is the secretary of our panel. When he is not here he is available in our information room in room 107 in this hotel, where you can get additional copies of briefs or make arrangements to receive them. You can

also arrange to do this through Brian Timmermans, who is also in that room at other times of the day. We have an intervenors' table at the front right which we ask intervenors to occupy in succession as they are scheduled. On the left is the gentleman representing Eldorado. The table at the far left in front of the screen is for representatives from the media. We have a court reporter in between the intervenors, and Brian Timmermans. We are taking transcripts of these hearings which will be available in roughly a week's time. In that connection, would you please use the microphone when speaking and identify yourself for the record. One final point is that we request there be no smoking in this room.

This afternoon Mrs. Ashby spoke to us, and we have her presentation here. There was a request that additional questioning continue this evening because some people were not available at the time, in particular, Mr. Laird wanted to have further clarification. Mr. Laird and Mrs. Ashby I see are sitting together. Perhaps you can now decide what you are going to tell us-- what you want to do.

MR. LAIRD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Before I get to Mrs. Ashby, at the request of the panel I have brought-- actually I had them

here last night but I felt you had enough on your plate so I did not bring them forward. I have two of the adjoining-- or the adjacent land owners here today. They are really not here to give a brief or a fifteen minute presentation, or anything else, but to probably make a brief statement about who they are and where they live and how they feel about this in just very few words. Then, if there are questions about their views and their circumstances from the panel, then they are quite happy to answer those questions. I think that I would call upon them first and then I will just have two very brief questions for Mrs. Ashby. That will be it. Hopefully it will not take too long.

I would like to call Ernie Webster up to the microphone. Ernie Webster is the gentleman who runs the forty cattle operation that we talked about yesterday. He is the husband of Mrs. Webster.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think it's fairly evident.

MR. LAIRD: Mrs. Webster on your plot there is designated as part A-- Elliott-Webster property. He is now sitting beside me, so without further delay I will push the microphone over.

MR. WEBSTER: My name is Ernie Webster. I am a dairy farmer and I live adjacent to

the Eldorado property in Port Granby. I might explain why I am here now.

In Port Granby, and adjacent to it -- between the family we have four properties. We have a large dairy farm, 150 acres, about two lots east of the Eldorado property-- to the east into Hope Township. My daughter has a small lot on the lake. My sister-in-law, Margaret Elliott, has a property with a house on it where we live. My wife and Margaret Elliott-- they have the property which is exactly next to the Eldorado property and to which a creek runs.

Now, I use this property as a part of my dairy operation. I have cattle there frequently, sometimes more, sometimes less. I have been quite active opposing this new nuclear dump. I notice the term has been used here so I will carry on using that same thing instead of a waste management residue. Anyway, I have been a member of SEAP. I am still a member of SEAP. I have not resigned-- actually I am Vice-President. I am here talking for myself and my concerns.

Now, I have been in this area quite a number of years. I was at the first meetings that were held with respect to the opening of the present

dump. You have got to realize that twenty-five years ago the climate was different. I feel very privileged to be here in front of this panel the way it's set up now. I think everybody should-- I know the younger people figure it's a right, but from the way things were when I was younger-- I know that companies like Eldorado were high security. You did not hear much. I would just like to describe what I remember. I was at the meeting. There were families who had trouble at the previous dump. Apparently the cattle were dying from something or other-- they didn't know what. It had been decided that they would buy a new residue site and the meeting was to discuss this. I do not remember who the Eldorado people were that were there. I do not think there were any local members of Parliament there. It was mainly Eldorado and the Department of Health.

Now, at that time the Department of Health were not much help and Eldorado made the claims that the new system, processes, things were safe. In that day and age we accepted just what people told us. I know a lot of you younger people here cannot realize that, but this is what used to happen. Anyway, we carried on for quite some years and weren't too concerned. A few small incidents-- we knew what was

in there wasn't the best in the world-- a few cattle died, so on, so on. But, until the spark that started to get us in opposition was when the thing broke in Port Hope. It was mentioned that all this residue from Port Hope was going to be put into this residue site beside the lake. That's the thing that fired it up and got it started. We are not hippies, we are not radicals, and not enough hair around here to make a batch of plaster. You can see that. We are just concerned people.

Now, as to what I am concerned about right now-- radioactivity is something I do not understand, I cannot see it, I cannot smell it, I cannot taste it. It's something I know nothing about. I have heard things about it being here and there. I do not want to be involved. I have got to the stage where I do not trust technology, the type of technology that would put this nuclear waste in a hole in the ground that was originally caused by erosion, and a special kind of erosion. This was no ordinary gulley. It was quite a hole. It was about ten acres across and the bottom of it was about level of the lake. It had a very narrow apeture to the lake, a gulley, and there was a stream that came out of it. It looked as though the earth out of that hole had dropped out just like

1 going down the drain hole in the bathtub. So, as I
2 say, it must have been some special kind of set of
3 conditions which caused this to erode quickly and get
4 out of there. So, I am assuming the same thing can
5 happen now. I am not an engineer, I have no
6 university education. All I depend upon is what I see.
7 Now, I do not feel safe with the
8 type of technology that puts waste in a hole like that.
9 I do not feel safe with the type of technology that
10 wants to put a nuclear dump and a facility on top of
11 a hill when we do not own the water shed. That's
12 important. As far as the soil is concerned, that's
13 something else I know about, but not in a chemical
14 sense but as a farmer. I know that the till which is
15 beneath the sand in that area is sand-- mainly sand
16 with very little clay. I think the EIS-- I have
17 studied it a little. What I see in there, I do not
18 see anything higher than twenty-six percent clay, in
19 any event. Most of it is much lower. From my own
20 observations with crops-- I have a similar farm
21 although the till is much nearer to the surface. The
22 till is within three feet to the surface in my own
23 farm. The surface is sandy and muggy, and much
24 similar, but little loamier. I notice when we grow
25 corn, you come to a dry spell-- you might get two

weeks or really dry weather and then you can see the places where that till has gravel in it. You can see it because the corn will shivel and dry up in certain places, here and there. I have seen it on a paying farm too. These are just observations. These are the types of things that make me-- well, the reasons I have in opposition to this thing. I think that's pretty near about all I've got to say.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Webster. I think although there are other questions and cross-questions, perhaps the panel may have questions of your statement first. Are there any? Kim Shikaze.

MR. SHIKAZE: Mr. Webster, we had the privilege of walking around the property a while back.

MR. WEBSTER: Yes.

MR. SHIKAZE: We had some very interesting discussions with you, and I enjoyed them. The first question I have to deal with is that you were involved twenty-twenty-five years ago in the discussions and exclamations with respect to the Port Granby dump. I can appreciate your comments with regard to possible security and everything else. Perhaps you might have been railroaded, or perhaps

bamboozled by what was being put forward. You did accept it.

Now, quite a lot of time has gone by and Eldorado have been there and operated, and there have been some problems. I would like to hear your comments with respect to their attitude, or their changed attitude if there has been any, or fear?

MR. WEBSTER: In the first part of it, Kim, I attended this meeting. At that time I had not been there that many years. I had been mainly at Port Granby. This other one was in Wesleyville in the east. I did not know too many people over there. I attended the meeting and I was not really acquainted with the people that lost cattle and had the main concerns. I didn't really have any input there at all. I was just there to listen. As I say, I do not remember too damn much about it. It is quite a long time ago. It was one of these things-- I know we accepted what was told to us and that was it.

MR. SHIKAZE: Do you think the company's attitude has changed over the years?

MR. WEBSTER: I am sure they have. I do not want to sound personal at all. I would be glad if no one accepts it that way, because I would say that the people from Eldorado at the present that we

have met-- some of their employees have been around different times, and they are personable people. Socially I would not-- I would be glad to meet them socially any time. I think their attitudes have changed.

Now, I do not think-- let me clarify this too. I think as far as Colbourne, and his staff is concerned-- I think this thing is hereditary. I mean, they got it just by default. I don't doubt that. But, it still doesn't-- you must realize it didn't do much for their credibility. This is why I have got the concerns.

MR. SHIKAZE: In other words what you are saying is you are not blaming the people there today--

MR. WEBSTER: That's right.

MR. SHIKAZE: You are more concerned about trusting the technology?

MR. WEBSTER: That's right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ellan Derow?

MS. DEROW: Mr. Webster, I was out on the property. Could you clarify a bit about the hole in the ground and erosion? I am not quite sure if I understand you.

MR. WEBSTER: I don't know

whether we should beat that too much, because it's gone by the board. I think you are interested in sociology. Another thing I forgot to talk about was sociology which is another aspect. I will say that the hole in the ground we are talking about is the current dump site.

MS. DEROW: It wasn't eroded? It wasn't a natural hole they filled?

MR. WEBSTER: It's a natural hole in the ground. It's caused by erosion, and a special kind of erosion. The reason I say this-- I think if you look at EIS, or at least some of Eldorado's-- I think that green book they put out, it shows there is sand, there is till, beneath the till is quick sand. Now, the reason for this going out-- as I say, I am not an engineer, but just from personal observations I believe a special set of circumstances occurred. I don't know when again this would happen. But, with the quick sand underneath this till going out into the lake, everything else dropped and went out too and it left a hole, as I say, with a surface area of about ten acres, in the shape of a mixing bowl. The cliff there is about seventy-eighty-ninety feet maybe, and it must have been ninety feet to the bottom of it. This all ran out through one little narrow gorge. It's like a

circle with a little narrow gorge.

MR. SHIKAZE: Mr. Webster, based on your personal knowledge and experience of that gulley, and the fact that that waste dump has been there for about twenty years now, suppose the refinery did not go ahead, have you any thoughts as to what should be done with that dump?

MR. WEBSTER: I thought that was already figured out. We went-- I personally wrote two letters to the minister describing this hole, describing the erosion, describing the conditions. I think some of this filtered down and the AECB made new rules. They have decided that that should be taken out.

MR. SHIKAZE: Which minister did you write to?

MR. WEBSTER: Gillespie.

THE CHAIRMAN: If I might follow on from Kim's question in this sense. If something has to be done with the existing dump, have you any comment on what should be done with it, if you feel something should be done?

MR. WEBSTER: Well, I don't think I am the guy to tell you what to do with the dump. I know the rules have been changed and it's supposed to be removed. Now, where, I am not going to waste that

on anybody.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Peter Bird?

MR. BIRD: Mr. Webster, if you have a concern about the existing dump site, the proposal that is in the EIS as to location of a new plant and a new waste disposal area further away-- now, the new area does not seem to have the same geological problem as the one that you talked about has.

MR. WEBSTER: Only several hundred yards back.

MR. BIRD: It's so far experienced the kind of problem--

MR. WEBSTER: I do not think so. It's not the edge of the cliff.

MR. BIRD: Do you have some concerns about that site as a possible place for--

MR. WEBSTER: Yes, I do.

MR. BIRD: In what?

MR. WEBSTER: As I mentioned before, the till is on sand, it's not impervious-- I know nothing about bentonite-- when I said the sand is not impervious, it's-- they have drilled it, they have made it less impervious by drilling it, and they may drill holes. It's less impervious than it was. I can

prove it's not impervious. I know nothing about bentonite, but I heard a comment or two about it last night. If you run out, you know where to come.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Grant?

MR. GRANT: Not the same material.

MR. BIRD: Where do you think the material would go through this would end up?

MR. WEBSTER: I am not saying it would go through. All I am saying is that I have not got the confidence in it. I am just stating my concerns. I am not an expert.

MR. BIRD: Can you give me your view as to how one would judge any area-- it was my understanding that Eldorado did drill a number of holes to get samples to try to determine what the cross section of the underlying soil was. Is this not a technique--

MR. WEBSTER: It's standard practice, and that's what they do. All I am stating is that it's-- you cannot say it's impervious.

MR. BIRD: It would seem to me to be pretty difficult then to go into any area without doing that-- you are virtually telling me you could never find--

MR. WEBSTER: This is probably one of the reasons that people are having problems with waste disposal. It's just one of the reasons.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think for the benefit of others who may not have been here, we have agreed earlier that a whole waste disposal area of our dump will be an issue in the second phase. We can probably discuss the technical aspects in more detail at that time.

MR. WEBSTER: I think that's acceptable.

MR. BIRD: One more question, Mr. Webster. If by any chance it were considered feasible to have all of the waste handled in a different area entirely, what would your view be about the construction of the plant itself on the site?

MR. WEBSTER: Well, I am a farmer and I do not like to see farm land covered over. I am a member of Federation of Agriculture. I have a brief in here-- I had input too. We've talked about land use in that too.

MR. BIRD: You would be against?

MR. WEBSTER: Yes, I am against using farm land, especially in this-- you have got to realize that there is very little good farm land. Now,

I have got to admit farmers can overproduce-- we are overproducing now. But, there is very little farm land that is viable, that's tillable in Canada in proportion to the mass that we have got. There is only about fourteen percent.

MR. BIRD: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions of Mr. Webster's comments before we move on to another part of your thing, Mr. Laird? Mr. Grant?

MR. GRANT: Mr. Chairman, I have a number of questions of Mr. Webster.

Mr. Webster raised the issue of credibility of my client. Therefore I think it's appropriate to ask him some questions concerning his credibility in all fairness. Mr. Webster, you said that--

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do not think your mike is on.

MR. GRANT: My questions really are relating to Mr. Webster's credibility and also his concern. I am not entirely satisfied that I understand your concern, Mr. Webster. One thing I do understand is perhaps the real reason for your alleged concern. You stated that you're concerned about the Eldorado use of this property for its refinery

purposes, and one of the principal reasons you mentioned was they did not own the water shed. Now, I know that it doesn't own all of the water shed on your side of the property. I have to be careful here because I understand that part of the property on the west side of the Eldorado property is not in fact owned by you, but is owned by your wife, and I believe her sister-in-law.

MR. WEBSTER: That's correct.

MR. GRANT: Now, you said you were also-- you did not like to see farm land covered over. I think you also said you did not like to see farm land used for non-farming purposes.

Now, Mr. Webster, is it not correct that you offered to sell ten acres of your land to my client at the fancy price of $30,000.00 an acre? By you, I don't mean you, I mean Mrs. Elliott and Mrs. Webster.

MR. WEBSTER: Mr. Grant, I would like to answer that myself.

MR. LAIRD: I have something to say about that.

THE CHAIRMAN: It's not a court procedure. Mr. Webster has made his comments and I do not think we need to discuss any further from this point of view. I would like to know if there are any

other clarification points, and if not, I would then like Mr. Laird to proceed with any other questions he may have of Mrs. Ashby. I understood you were going to ask questions, Mr. Laird?

MR. WEBSTER: John, I would like to answer Mr. Grant. I would like to answer you, Mr. Grant. The answer is that I just as soon as see you go away as take your money.

MR. GRANT: But you did ask us $30,000.00 per acre for your land; did you not?

THE CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, we are not-- we can investigate everybody if we want, but I do not think it's particularly necessary to get into it at this point. I understood from you, Mr. Laird, that you wanted to ask further questions of Mrs. Ashby. Is that correct?

MR. LAIRD: Has Mr. Grant finished his questions?

MR. GRANT: I want to comment that it is Mr. Webster who raised the question of credibility. So my questions are not misunderstood, he is the one that alleges my client's credibility in his question. I think it is relevant.

MR. LAIRD: The sort of credibility, in all due respect--

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not need two lawyers sitting here and arguing and using me as a mouth-piece, thank you very much. I accept the fact that everybody's credibility is in question here. We will take it at that. Can we either proceed with the questions, Mr. Laird, or move to the next intervenor.

MR. LAIRD: I have Mr. Hubbard here as well, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is Mr. Hubbard--

MR. LAIRD: He's parcel D on your sketch.

THE CHAIRMAN: I know. You keep coming up with new people at me. I already have a schedule. We could have scheduled additional people.

MR. LAIRD: I thought I had cleared that with the panel, Mr. Chairman. I am in your hands. I will do whatever you suggest.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you think Mr. Hubbard will speak for a long time?

MR. LAIRD: No. I think he will be very brief.

THE CHAIRMAN: Please proceed.

MR. HUBBARD: My name is Howard Hubbard and I am the owner of property in Port Granby

very close to the Eldorado property. I purchased that in 1960. I was completely aware of the Eldorado dump at the time that I purchased the property. I lived in that humble domicile continuously since 1969, at which time I retired.

It is with great reluctance that I accept the fact that nuclear fuels for peace purposes are necessary at the present time. In late 1943 I was involved in a very minor way in the Manhattan project. In order to sum my vague knowledge of nuclear-- I do not agree that the use of the atom bomb was justified. It's just to make a point.

I do agree that continued Canadian research with fissionable materials is desirable in order to keep abreast of technology in this regard. It is with considered distress that I learned that Eldorado Nuclear had purchased property in the Port Granby area for a new facility to produce UF6. My concern is exactly the same as those concerns expressed by many of the previous speakers. I'm as nervous as a nudist going through a barbed wire fence when I concentrate that the operation have an additional facility so close to my little home. I can't believe that it was not completely feasible and possible to choose an area in some much more remote place than

being the present site, preferably on the pre-cambrian shield, as was suggested last night.

In any event, the so-called exclusion zone or buffer zone I do not think is large enough - wide enough, particularly with respect to the proximity to the lake, but also with proximity to human habitation in the area where the present site is located, and where the facility is planned. By going to a non-farming area many of the other objections voiced would be satisfied that it would not be using farm land that perhaps is not so vital at the present moment, but could become much more vital in years to come.

Another one of my concerns is the fact that the road across the Eldorado property-- the three farms that they purchased is a so-called forced road or donated road. It is not a legal width for the full distance, and it's not constructed in any-- it just grew up like top seed. It wasn't designed as a proper road. The drainage facilities and so on are completely inadequate. It cannot sustain in its present state any heavy traffic whatsoever. This is a personal concern of mine chiefly because our house is located very close to the travelled portion of the road.

The other purely personal slant is the fact that while the value of farm land has appreciated tremendously by the advent of Eldorado, I am afraid that the value of recreational land, or a lot such as mine has been depressed in value because of the proximity to this operation. Now, in future years this may change depending upon the operation and the care with which the contaminants or affluents are controlled.

As Mr. Webster stated, the proposed site for the plant is on high land. It is obvious to anyone that the drainage from that area goes down into the creek that runs across generally the western portion of part of Eldorado's property and through Mrs. Elliott's and Mrs. Webster's lot.

In conclusion, I submit that this facility-- it was a poor choice. Perhaps from a convenient standpoint-- I am sure it's an excellent choice as far as Eldorado is concerned. If I were in their position I would endeavour to locate there for various obvious reasons. But, from the standpoint on the fact of environment and use of farm land, I think the choice is extremely poor. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Hubbard. Mr. Shikaze?

MR. SHIKAZE: Mr. Hubbard, you

have made a number of points with respect to this particular proposed operation. One of the things you said is that you didn't object basically to nuclear, or Canada being involved in a nuclear program. Did I understand you correctly there?

MR. HUBBARD: That's correct.

MR. SHIKAZE: Your objection then, I take it, is the location of a nuclear plant right next to your property?

MR. HUBBARD: That's right, on farm land and so on.

MR. SHIKAZE: Suppose I decided to build a clean factory of about the same size as Eldorado making hockey sticks or something. Would you object to that?

MR. HUBBARD: You're right. I see what you mean. If Dow Checmical or Dupont--someone else--

MR. SHIKAZE: Not them, but a clean industry like making hockey sticks. A good Canadian industry.

MR. HUBBARD: My objection would not be nearly so keen as the objection to this kind of a facility. It is simply for exactly the same reasons as stated by many of the speakers of the possibility

of contamination. To go to an extreme, after the next ice age has receded and glaciers have moved away, it is quite possible that all this waste material will be exposed to generations to come.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ellan Derow?

MS. DEROW: I was wondering if you have been able to read either Appendix 1 or 2 concerned with site selection? There are two appendices to the major report.

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, I have glanced. I have not made any attempt to study them, but I have glanced through them. I know that other sites were considered and so on.

MS. DEROW: So you have nothing to say about the other sites in particular?

MR. HUBBARD: Not in particular. It was simply that in the interest of brevity my stand is simply that this was-- must be a poor choice when you consider other areas that are available.

MS. DEROW: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Clement Cheng?

MR. CHENG: You mentioned that since the proposal has been put forward your property has likely depreciated in value. Do you have any supporting evidence of this on your property?

MR. HUBBARD: No. It is simply my personal opinion, that while other properties have been sold for quite substantial figures in the area I think generally that the value of my particular little spot has been depressed to some extent since it has become common knowledge that Eldorado intend to put up a facility on the property they have purchased.

MR. CHENG: What kind of factors led you to this?

MR. HUBBARD: Simply adverse publicity that has been generated and by the problems encountered in Port Hope.

MR. CHENG: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Murray Duncan?

MR. DUNCAN: Mr. Hubbard, regardless of the adequacy of the particular site, we are still in the position of having to judge this adequacy. You made a remark that you do not think the buffer zone is wide enough. You stated that the proximity to the lake and human habitation is of concern here. I wonder if you can expand on what you would consider to be an adequate buffer zone, and what your concept is of it in terms of the criteria for its adequacy.

MR. HUBBARD: I have not

prepared any brief on such a thing. My opinion is simply that in handling the materials-- as I understand them going to be involved, the possibility of spillage and wind dispersal and things of this nature. I would feel more comfortable if we had at least a mile buffer zone, rather than the eight hundred metres that's suggested.

MR. DUNCAN: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Peter Bird?

MR. BIRD: Mr. Hubbard, you have commented on the fact that if another type of industry were planned there, a so-called clean industry, you might have a different view. You are not absolutely certain of that, but at least you would give it more careful consideration. This suggests that the agricultural use, while a factor, is not necessarily the only consideration in your mind. You went on to point out about the drainage problem sloping westerly and running into the creek which would go through your property.

MR. HUBBARD: Well, the creek touches the property.

MR. BIRD: Through other private property.

MR. HUBBARD: That's right.

MR. BIRD: In examining the EIS that has been prepared, the environmental impact statement, the consultants have given pretty careful consideration to the possibility of accidents, normal times of operations, and the potential for spillage, runoff, contamination and so on. In the document they state that precautions would be taken. In your experience with Manhattan project I suspect would lead you to believe that there is technology to monitor for such things, and engineering would seem at least arguable that they could take certain precautions to avoid contamination reaching that creek. Would it be your concern that you just don't have enough confidence that the technology is there, or that you don't believe that it's possible to trap the contamination if it were to occur, or you do not feel confident the plans outlined in the document are even sound at all? Why do you express such great concern when there is all that documented evidence that would say the problem can be looked after?

MR. HUBBARD: Well, Doctor Bird, I have complete confidence that the technology is there. There is no doubt whatsoever in my mind about that. What I am concerned with is the possibility of accidents. There are numerous instances, but I am not

1 going to bore the panel with these details-- involving
2 transportation of crude oil, for instance, so on, so
3 on. The possibility of accident is ever present there.
4 As a very close neighbour to a hazard-- as Mr. Webster
5 expressed, it's impossible to smell, feel, hear-- I am
6 nervous.

7 MR. BIRD: You don't think that
8 with the various stages of approval that are required
9 these days-- I think everyone will agree that
10 industry is very much more regulated today than it was
11 twenty years ago, for example.

12 MR. HUBBARD: Yes.

13 MR. BIRD: The steps that are
14 taken there don't give you any comfort whatsoever?
15 You still feel--

16 MR. HUBARD: They give me
17 considerable comfort, but not complete security.
18 That's the best way I can express it.

19 MR. BIRD: In effect you feel
20 a lot happier if the plant were located elsewhere?

21 MR. HUBBARD: Yes, very much so.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Any questions
23 of Mr. Hubbard? Mr. Grant.

24 MR. GRANT: Mr. Hubbard, you
25 mentioned that you would feel more secure if the so-

called exclusionary zone had a radius of about a mile. Is that what your--

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, approximately.

MR. GRANT: Would that radius then encompass your property?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, it would.

MR. GRANT: Have you instructed Mr. Gimblett, or some other real estate agent to endeavour to sell your property to my client?

MR. HUBBARD: No, I haven't.

MR. GRANT: You have not?

MR. HUBBARD: No.

MR. GRANT: Do you own the property?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, in conjunction with my wife.

MR. GRANT: You have not given instructions to Mr. Gimblett?

MR. HUBBARD: No.

MR. GRANT: Did you instruct Mr. Laird to represent you here?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes.

MR. GRANT: Did you read his brief presented last night?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes.

MR. GRANT: In his brief he said that as an alternative solution to the concern, which he was voicing on your behalf, that you, including one of his clients-- they, including you, would consider the possibility of a negotiated sale of your property but would totally reject an arbitrary expropriation procedure. Did you instruct Mr. Laird to say that?

MR. HUBBARD: Nothing to do with the sale of it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, I think it is obvious that if anybody wants to put in anything -- if they have unlimited resources, can buy twenty miles of the area if they want to and then move all the people out. I am not quite sure how continuing that discussion is going to lead us to address any further concerns at this time. Perhaps we could move on to Mrs. Ashby, who has been sitting very quietly at the end of the table.

MR. LAIRD: Well, Mr. Chairman, I did not have the benefit of hearing Mrs. Ashby this afternoon, but I do not want to belabour-- I just wanted to ask her whether she felt that the farm-- the creek running through the farm of her father was affected by the dump site that was located near the farm.

MRS. ASHBY: It certainly was.

MR. LAIRD: Secondly, Mrs. Ashby, do you feel in the contacts that you had with Eldorado over the years on these matters-- or your father did that Eldorado recognized these concerns and took the appropriate steps to satisfy you?

MRS. ASHBY: No. I am afraid not.

MR. LAIRD: Those are my questions, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Laird. Are there any further questions of Mrs. Ashby? She actually went through a series of questions this afternoon, so I would not imagine there be too many again. Mr. Grant.

MR. GRANT: Mr. Chairman, it is not a question. Mrs. Ashby raised some interesting matters this afternoon. I would like to direct the attention to the panel to two publications relating to water quality in the area with which Mrs. Ashby is concerned in Lake Ontario. They are publications of the International Joint Commission. They are entitled Great Lakes Water Quality 1976 Annual Report, and Appendix D to that report, Radioactivity Subcommittee. I left it with Mr. Timmermans a brief excerpt from those two-- that report as well as the main report.

In particular, I would refer the attention to the panel to page fifty-two of the principal report and to page thirty-seven-- page twenty-one of the principal report and page fifty-two of the principal report and page thirty-seven of the appendix. I would leave these copies of these reports with the panel except that they are rather difficult to secure. They can be apparently secured from the International Joint Commission, whose address is 100 Ouellette Street in Windsor, Ontario.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am sure we can get the reports. Thank you for bringing those points to our attention. We can no doubt check them when we get the transcript. We can now proceed to our next speaker, who is Tony McQuail, resident of Lucknow it says here. With the luck we have been having, he may not be.

MR. McQUAIL: I am Tony McQuail. I am a farmer in the Lucknow area. Perhaps I should say that I do not own any property within two hundred miles of the Eldorado proposed site. I do not know how that will affect my credibility, but I offer it to you. I have a degree in environmental studies from the University of Waterloo-- an honours degree. I am associated with the group known as CANTDO. I thought I would give you a bit of history with that group since

my involvement with them is my reason for being here tonight. In 1973 a group of concerned citizens in Godrich got together to learn more about nuclear energy. They didn't know much but they did not feel very reassured by the vague things being put out by ACL and Ontario Hydro. At that time they were concerned because the Bruce Nuclear power development, about 50 miles to the north-- there are some rumours, perennial rumours about the plant somewhere near Godrich.

In 1974, after a period of research in trying to get the other side of the story, we published a case for alternative to nuclear power-- it was about a 20-page pamphlet on our concerns with regard to nuclear power. Then in 1975 we became involved with five other anti-nuclear groups in Ontario to form the Ontario Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility which has been working towards making presentations to the Porter Commission. In 1976 we started publishing a quarterly newsletter called Friends of CANTDO. This was to try to make people more aware of the alternative information which was available in nuclear power, and to present sort of an alternative voice on nuclear power in our area of Ontario. In 1977 we finally completed the Ontario Coalition for Nuclear Responsibi-

lity submission to Porter.

We have gone from a group of concerned but uninformed citizens to an informed and extremely concerned group. As we have learned more about the many environmental, social, political and ethical problems inherent in nuclear development, we have adopted an increasingly strong stand against further commitment to any sector of the nuclear program. That is why I am here tonight, to state CANTDO's opposition to Eldorado Nuclear's plan in a new uranium refinery and expand dump facilities. To provide you with details and documentation of our concern, I would like to present you with a copy of Half Life, nuclear power and future society, which is this document here. I did not send it ahead because I think you would have had a hard time reproducing it--also because it wasn't back from the printers until just recently. It is the Ontario Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility's submission to the Porter Commission. We believe it contains information which should be useful for your assessment. I hope you will have a chance to go through it. I am sorry in some way it is so big, but it does try to document a number of the problems associated with the nuclear site in all its areas. I really feel concerned that we do not try--

don't just say that we can separate the environmental from social or political-- I think those all get tied together as we look at broad and long-term consequences of nuclear future. Let me present you with a copy of this. If people want additional copies, they are available from CANTDO. We have to charge what it cost to print them. It does cost ten bucks to get them printed. If people want them, I brought some extra copies with me but there has to be a charge for them.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. McQuail. I guess the panel should read your presentation and ask questions, but that's going to make it a bit long.

MR. McQUAIL: I realize it's a problem.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ellan Derow.

MS. DEROW: Have you been able to look at the environmental impact assessment for the Port Granby project?

MR. McQUAIL: I am sorry, I have not. Our opposition to it is not on a specific-- this side or that side, that farm or this farm. Our opposition is a general opposition we've developed because of our concerns with the overall nuclear program and any furtherance of it. Whether it was this

1 particular site or that site further in Eastern
2 Ontario, up on the shield, next door to me in Heron
3 County, our opposition would still be strong.
4 THE CHAIRMAN: Kim Shikaze.
5 MR. SHIKAZE: I have not asked
6 this question before, but a number of groups have come
7 up in general opposition to nuclear power development.
8 I believe it's against nuclear power development. Do
9 you have a statement to make with respect to uses of
10 radiation or parts of nuclear activity-- radiation
11 activity for medical purposes, or other scientific
12 purposes?
13 MR. McQUAIL: I think in
14 extremely controlled fashion that there certainly has
15 been in the past, and there will continue to be a
16 place for use of radioactive materials. One of the
17 things which gets to be a very touchy ethical problem
18 is how much the exposure is, a matter of individual
19 choice with expert guidance such as in the use of
20 medical diagnostic x-rays, or whether it's something
21 that may involve just a general problem for the
22 population without any sense of personal decision. I
23 think in terms of medical use of radiation we need to
24 see a much greater tightening down on the uses. I am
25 afraid in my personal contact with radiologists, they

often don't know what ram exposure they are shooting you up with when they give you an x-ray. There are so many uncertainties and general lacks of knowledge in the field of radiation effects. I think there is certainly a place for x-rays in that sort of development, but that needs to be continually monitored as well and probably tightened down.

MR. SHIKAZE: Expecting there is going to be some uses in that particular area, then there is a need to produce the materials needed for that?

MR. McQUAIL: How many tons of uranium hexafluoride do we need for x-rays? Surely there are some-- the quantity I think is quite a bit different to a nuclear development as an energy source.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would like to ask one question which perhaps you would like to answer. We are faced with a disposal site that exists now. I appreciate your general opposition to nuclear development, but there is a problem. Have you any comment you could make on disposal in general, or in particular of the existing site, or proposed site in the same general area?

MR. McQUAIL: I'm sorry, I can't deal with that in that specific area. Again I

apologize for not having studied-- there is a limit to how much a person can study, as I am sure you are becoming more aware of every day. As far as what do we do with our wastes, and that is one of the major problems with the whole nuclear program-- if you start a new waste disposal facility to cope with the old waste disposal facility, what reassurance do we have that in twenty years from now we will not have to develop a further waste disposal to deal with the new one. You have got a waste disposal facility and you were saying it has not worked out and we need to develop a new waste disposal facility, and I am not sure that the record would give us a great deal of confidence in saying that we'll not have a similar problem with the new waste disposal facility. There are certainly some methods which show a promise of-- for waste disposal. All of these also have certain questions about them. They are dealt with in the submission in much greater detail than I should deal with them now. I think our group has come to feel if there were moratorium on further nuclear development and refining of developing, producing uranium hexafluoride-- if there were a moratorium on further production of radioactive materials for energy use, we could considerably cope with storing our present radioactive waste that some of

the techniques for the disposal could possibly be developed and safely utilized. But that to continue developing towards a nuclear economy, continuing processing and refining materials for this economy is creating a waste problem which has gotten-- which is presently a problem which is getting further and further out of hand. We deal with some of those methods in the submission.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Any questions from the floor? Thank you, Mr. McQuail. I am sure we will be interested to receive your report. Our next speaker is Bill Borger of PANDA.

MR. BORGER: I am Bill Borger, PANDA chairman, People Against Nuclear Development Anywhere. I am a geography department head at the High School of Prescott, a school of approximately 1500 students. Our title of our brief is The Government, Morality and Nuclear Energy.

PANDA (People Against Nuclear Development Anywhere) was conceived on April 4th of 1977. Its members come from an area between Gananoque and Morrisburg in the southeastern part of Ontario. PANDA's members are concerned with the proposed increase of nuclear power plants in Ontario and elsewhere, and we reject any nuclear energy based future. PANDA's

aims and objectives are three-fold:

1) To educate the public about nuclear energy;

2) To alert and educate the public to the dangers of nuclear energy;

3) To educate and inform the public about the alternatives to a nuclear based future.

PANDA's membership, which includes a one dollar membership fee is open to all who are concerned with the future of Ontario and her people. Our group is a young one and we have not yet had the chance to initiate a large-scale membership drive. Consequently our membership is still small but it is representative of the Gananoque to Morrisburg area, and members come from every walk of life.

We believe that as residents of Ontario we must speak out concerning any energy policy decisions in our province. It is essential that all residents of Ontario inform themselves about the present energy proposals being offered by Ontario Hydro, especially in the controversial area of nuclear energy. PANDA is a concerned and acition-oriented interest group representative of many Ontario residents who wish to have input into their energy future. We believe that groups such as PANDA are necessary to present public concerns and allow the government and

its agencies to gauge and act upon these public concerns. The reason why PANDA is involved in the Environmental Assessment Board hearings reagarding the Port Granby uranium refinery is two fold. The first reason is due to a phone call from SEAP (Save the Environment from Atomic Pollution) which requested PANDA to present their views at the public hearing. SEAP did not receive funds to enable them to prepare a document that can compete with Eldorado's publicity. It's like the "golden rule", those who have the gold make the rules. How can SEAP compete with Eldorado, a Crown corporation backed by the Federal Government? Also, AECL, Ontario Hydro, the Ontario Government and several large corporations are all backing this project. As a result of this unfair competition PANDA agreed to help SEAP by presenting a brief.

The second reason for getting involved is our concern over radiation pollution. All radioactive material that enters Lake Ontario flows by our communities via the St. Lawrence river. The water is used for drinking, swimming and other recreational activities including a large tourist business. PANDA knows that the radioactive dump site at Welcome and Port Granby which receive radioactive material from the Eldorado refinery is polluting Lake Ontario.

Eldorado maintains that the contaminants are quickly dispersed by the volume of lake water. This is what they used to say about mercury entering large bodies of water. The brief is not highly technical, for we are not scientists, however, the submission will examine Eldorado's past, present and future record and will briefly discuss the morality of the whole nuclear issue of which the proposed refinery is a major link in the chain.

ELDORADO'S RECORD: PAST

Eldorado's record in the past speaks for itself with all the radioactive pollution problems that have occurred in Port Hope and surrounding area. All these incidents, like the closing of a school, removal of 1000's of cubic yards of radioactive fill from Port Hope, removal of the radioactive fill from the Port Hope beach which took 25 years to remove, have all been well published by the press. Since we were given a time limit for our presentation the incidents will not be repeated in this brief for the exception of one major incident which affects PANDA members. The incident deals with Eldorado's nuclear dumps runoff of 4,500 gallons a day into Lake Ontario. (Globe and Mail, February 6, 1976). This "pump-pushed flow of more than 4,500 gallons" containing radium,

uranium and arsenic does not disturb our government because, it says, the lake can handle it - just as Lake Erie could handle all those insults from its ring of factories and tributaries - just as the river and land around Elliot Lake could handle it - just as the Whitehorse area could take the arsenic - just as the English and Wabigoon Rivers could handle the mercury.

Radioactivity does not distribute evenly. The report of the Federal Department of Fisheries and Environment to the Porter Commission points out that pools of tritium have been observed off Pickering, which give high concentration to some areas. Food chains make certain that the distribution is not even; a species of clam collects cobalt-60 into dangerous doses; children collect strontium-90 in their bones; bass will accumulate cesium-137 up to one thousand times the concentration of the surrounding water; the bluegill does the same for strontium-90 up to two thousand times, and for radioactive zink up to nearly nine thousand times; the caddisfly concentrates radioactivity up to 350,000 times. The swallow, which eats insects that have a concentration of 2,000 times, "may carry 75,000 times the ambient level".

PRESENT:

At present the Ontario Government,

AECL and Eldorado are trying desperately to cover up their bad record of the past. The Ontario Government is pumping in thousands of dollars into the community of Port Hope to revive its economy. AECL is trying to clean up the community but from the last newspaper report the school was still closed due to high readings of radon gas. Ever since Eldorado announced on January 7th, 1977 its choice of the Port Granby site for the planned refining and waste management facility the company immediately launched a comprehensive program of public communications. Information centres were set up in several communities, 20,000 households received brochures, meetings were held with service clubs all of which didn't seem to convince the people. In a final attempt the company put in large advertisements in the district newspapers. One could say that the industrial-government partnership has reasons for wanting an unbelievable edge on those who are trying to make known any other view or who are trying to voice criticism. It reminds one of the last Nixon election. The analogy can be carried farther too, if one thinks of Canada's clandestine uranium cartel affair and the millions that will be made for a select group of people whose San Clemente or Bahama beaches will never know pollution.

The greed of growth can always find

ways to justify itself. The staffed information centres are not unlike those staffed centres that Ontario Hydro sales branch used to set up across the province, to convince people that they should be using more electricity. The growth rate of 8% at the time was still not enough to satisfy the greed.

FUTURE:

Eldorado's future depends on its new refinery in Port Granby which will produce UF6 which is for foreign use. Are we polluting for export, only for the Candu reactors do not use enriched uranium? The EIS was written by independent scientists and engineers but how many environmentalists had input into the report. Let's ask a few questions about the "mini" EIS report.

1) What were the environmental difficulties at Burwash? Could the local river not hide uranium, radium and arsenic as well as Lake Ontario can?

2) "... shallow water conditions" at Blind River! would this keep the pollution from dispersing - this pollution that is negligible anyway?

3) In management of wastes you talk about minimize pollution. Minimize is a specious word. It says nothing except that pollution is balanced off against "plant efficiency and safety". Are they

saying that every refinery pollutes and that there is nothing wrong with Eldorado pollutin still further?

4) Eldorado plans to monitor the drainage channels but monitoring simply means being aware of the analysis. What did monitoring do for the Indians and mercury?

5) Small amounts of fill gave Port Hope residents radon gas. How could this whole proposed new dump site some day be unrestricted even for recreational use?

6) It is stated that it would take "many years" for contaminated water to enter the water table. Those polluting elements hav- all the time in the world. They are not changed by bacteria in septic tank fashion. What about wells in other directions?

7) It states that according to Eldorado's calculations it would take 12,000 years before the contaminants would reach Lake Ontario. All this talk is based on the assumption that nothing goes wrong. What if something goes wrong in 10 years, or 100 years?

8) Has this bentonite blanket idea ever been tried out? If so, for how long?

These are only a few of the questions that should be answered before permission is granted to build the refinery.

Since this hearing does not deal with the nuclear debate the second part of the brief which deals with the moral issue will be short. It is morally wrong to continue with nuclear energy under present conditions. This means that it is morally wrong to build a new refinery at Port Granby for the refinery stage is a major part in the nuclear process. All the steps in the nuclear industry are morally wrong. Uranium mines at Elliot Lake have double the incidence of lung cancer than the normal rate. It is morally wrong to pollute the rivers and lakes around Elliot Lake with radiation which comes from the uranium ore tailings. It is morally wrong for Eldorado's dump sites to pollute Lake Ontario with radioactive pollutants, regardless of how small the quantity. If nuclear power plants are so safe how come my insurance policy will not cover my house for "loss or damage caused by contaminations by radioactive material". Or why won't insurance companies insure nuclear power plants? Probably the greatest moral wrong is the waste material that will remain with us for over 250,000 years.

The government puts forth the impression in its propaganda that Candu with its once-through fuel makes us aloof from plutonium and

fast breeder problems. We are not. Here are the words of J.S. Foster, president of AECL, spokesman at a seminar for federal government agencies (trying to convince them to support reprocessing): "Plutonium recycle is not the main objective of our proposed program but plutonium is an extremely useful material and we will be dealing in it." (28 February, 1977)

The list can go on like, what about AECL's payment of bribes or the uranium cartel that was formed by our government or why is the Darlington plant going ahead without an environmental impact study and without waiting for the Porter Commission Report?

In conclusion, PANDA would like to leave the environmental assessment board with two thoughts, both should be remembered when the board's decision is made (1) People do not trust governments and Eldorado is a Crown company. It has been shown over and over again that governments lie especially in the nuclear field. The best example is the Madoc affair. Did they inform the people what the government really has planned for that area? A fuel recycle demonstration plant, which involves storing of irradiated bundles from nuclear plants, a plant to reprocess these fuel bundles, fabricate new fuel

bundles and to attempt to solidify the waste and bury it. No place on the North American continent is waste now being solidified and buried. As well, there is not one single commercial reprocessing plant operating on the North American continent. West Valley gave up, after expanding the waste into thousands of gallons of a radioactive acid solution that they don't know what to do with. It is eating through the tanks and leaking.

Many more examples could be given like what about the army's 1950 radioactivity report of Port Hope or why was it the press that forced government to act in Port Hope.

(2) The second point deals with the hearings themselves. Who sets the guidelines? Who picks the members, and who makes the final decisions? In far too many examples nuclear decisions are made by people who have worked in the nuclear industry. These scientists depend on their living from the nuclear industry. How many environmentalists that have never been connected with the nuclear industry sit on this board? If the board can overcome these two factors maybe a fair decision will be given. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you,

Mr. Borger. Any questions from the panel?

MR. SHIKAZE: Just a very slight point of clarification on your second page. I do not think people in Whitehorse would be very excited if you attribute arsenic problem to them. I believe you meant Yellowknife?

MR. BORGER: Right. The brief was written last night and finished by midnight. It is possible a few more mistakes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any questions from the floor? We have one.

SHEILA CLARK: Just on the point of clarification, on page three you say that the Ontario Government is pumping thousands of dollars into the community of Port Hope to revive the community. Can you--

THE CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, identify yourself.

SHEILA CLARK: I am Sheila Clark with CHUC Radio, Cobourg.

MR. BORGER: The only report we have on that is that the radio stating they were putting in a recreational centre in the Port Hope area. It was over local radio station.

SHEILA CLARK: It's not Eldorado

centre.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, the gentleman at the microphone.

MR. PANTA: I am Bill Panta, Port Granby. Would you please give more clarification on that statement you made? Would you please to make a clarification on that statement you made regarding your house insurance? Thank you.

MR. BORGER: That statement was taken right from my policy. I looked at it last night and I copied it word for word from my fire insurance policy. I think it might be a good idea for everyone to check the policy.

MR. PANTA: You mean if your house is close to any nuclear dump site the insurance company will not give you any insurance for your property, house and so forth?

MR. BORGER: According to my policy, yes.

MR. PANTA: That's important to me, sir, because--

MR. GRANT: Do not be misled by that, Mr. Panta. I am a lawyer and I can tell you that is not true.

MR. BORGER: Mr. Chairman, I am

sorry, I had thought of bringing my policy along. We have checked other policies in the area from other PANDA members and it is the same thing in them all.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am sure the policy says that and I am sure mine does too. It also says my house is not covered for fire, insurrection and riots and a few other things. I think the general approach is that we might ask Mr. Grant to clarify a statement-- if Mr. Laird would like to verify Mr. Grant's statement is correct, perhaps we could make use of the lawyers that we have here. Maybe they can help us all along.

MR. GRANT: Mr. Chairman, last night we heard this gentleman, who I had great sympathy for, in his concern and fear of the various things happening in the nuclear area. He's now raised another one, quite legitimately. I am fearful that he is going to go away with the misunderstanding of the response to the question he asked. His question is, and correct me if I am wrong-- your question was, did you understand correctly that because your property was located close to a nuclear facility that your insurance was in jeopardy. Was that your question?

MR. PANTA: That was the question.

MR. GRANT: The answer to that

question is that it is not in jeopardy. What our friend here is dealing with is with an entirely different problem. The problem he is dealing with is that most insurance policies do not cover recovery for a nuclear hall cast. I do not want you to be--

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Laird--

MR. BORGER: If I can photostat my policy and send it into the hearing--

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Borger, if you want to send your policy, that's fine. Mr. Laird.

MR. PANTA: My concern is regarding that statement by the gentleman there. I would like to know if my house is close to the Eldorado Nuclear Limited project the insurance company would come out and jeopardize me because the pollution rising of that plant, or so forth. That's the only question I would like to clear. Furthermore, Mr. Grant stated very clearly just a few minutes ago-- I have been here last night and my fear is still with me. I think that fear will be with me until this nuclear pollution and radiation will exist. I don't know if anybody can sold that for the next 250,000 years. You gentlemen up there in the panel, I am pretty sure are scientists, professors, and we are here on the floor and we are awaiting your decision. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I don't want to particularly pursue the insurance issue any further, unless, Mr. Grant, you feel you have not made your point and wish to discuss it further since it appears we gave Mr. Panta time to make his point.

MR. GRANT: So long as he is satisfied. It bothers me and bothers my client of the misunderstanding. Mr. Panta expressed last night in a very sincere and genuine manner his concern as an immediate neighbour to our facility. I would not want him to leave here thinking this evening that he has a problem with his insurance policy because of our proposal. That is sheer nonsense. I do not like to think that we are part of the fostering of any kind of ridiculous false fears. That's why I have difficulty in dealing with this gentleman's brief. He makes so many allegations in there. He's not proposed of this panel to support any of those allegations by any detail. In fact, his reference with respect to Port Hope comes from a very, very superficial statement that the government is putting $100,000.00 into recreation.

MR. BORGER: I did not say $100,000.00. I said $1,000.00.

MR. GRANT: I think if we are not going to have a debate, let's not have a debate in the

guides of the presentation of a brief of that nature. If we want a debate, we are prepared to debate too.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am sure you are. I think we will probably have a debate in the second phase. There is a speaker at the microphone.

MR. BEGG: Quentin Begg, a resident of Port Hope. A point of urgence. There was a statement made by the speaker and clarified by Sheila of CHUC Radio that the government and Eldorado Nuclear were paying for new sports facility in Port Hope. I would like to know if this is correct as I would like to rush out and cancel my cheque for $300.00 as a pledge to the new sports centre as resident of Port Hope.

THE CHAIRMAN: I did not think the hearings would get into sports facilities. Any other questions? There is a gentleman at the microphone.

MR. CARTER: I think it might help if I clarify. My name is Tom Carter from Ontario Hydro, Radiation, Waste Management. There are three points Mr. McQuail brought up. One was the fact that Ontario Hydro-- I believe he mentioned along with AECL -- Mr. Borger, Ontario Hydro has some interest along with AECL, I believe, and others, and at present, Eldorado Nuclear expansion. To my knowledge, hydro has

no interest in it. Again, for the very point that it is designed to produce UF6, and Ontario Hydro reactors do not use as a fuel. One other point regarding-- somewhat a small point, the fact Darlington was not included under the Porter Commission in terms of reference. Well, indeed it wasn't because the terms of reference to the Porter Commission was up to 1995, a long-term future for electric energy utilization of Ontario, and Darlington has already advanced stage of planning at that time. That's the reason it wasn't included.

MR. LANG: Mr. Chairman, I would like to get something straight here. You are volunteering some information which we didn't ask for. I think you're opening yourself up to some questions about Darlington. I hope you will be back, because I have a few I would like to ask you.

MR. CARTER: I was under the impression that we were trying to make sure whatever was read into the record was accurate as possible.

MR. LANG: That's correct. I am saying now that I hope you are back next week when we go to Newcastle. Can you be there? You've raised this question and now I would like to ask some questions about it.

MR. CARTER: The one last point, if

I may, with regard to the insurance aspect, that the federal government requires that-- I will paraphrase the situation. It requires that all nuclear facility operators indemnify themselves against contamination of the public domain, you might say. This is past-- I believe it's federal Order-in-Council in the fall of '76. To my knowledge indeed it's true, that most insurance policies do not include contamination of your property or whatever from radioactive contamination. But, the object of the federal requirement for all nuclear facility operators is designed somewhat to cover that circumstance.

MR. LANG: I would like an answer to my question. Will you be here next week at Newcastle? Please?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think we will leave it up to anybody as to whether or not they intend to participate. If you would like to give an answer, it might make it easier.

MR. CARTER: I would be there no doubt as a member of the public.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Any further questions?

MR. BORGER: Do I have a chance to answer those three points? As you say, it's not a

debate, so--

THE CHAIRMAN: That's correct. If you feel you wish to clarify-- do you want to get into a debate? I don't want to.

MR. BORGER: I will accept your rules and conditions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any further questions? Let us take a fifteen-minute coffee break.

--- SHORT RECESS

--- UPON COMMENCING

THE CHAIRMAN: Our next speaker is Ian Connerty for Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility.

MR. CONNERTY: My name is Ian Connerty, National Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility which is a national organization representing two hundred environmental and public interest groups across Canada. It was established two years ago with eight groups and has grown since then spontaneously to over two hundred groups. The coalition coalesces around the nuclear energy and all of its many and varied forms, and all of its many and varied implications. Canadian movement to question, and be concerned about nuclear energy is five or ten years behind the international movements. The kind of dialogue we have in Canada over the last two years is significantly different than what

we are now seeing in the United States and Europe, especially in Western Europe where its confrontation has now reached the stage where we have massive demonstrations, massive police arrests and deaths, just to oppose something that governments want to impose.

In Canada, the movement has been very democratic and has sought to have its input into public forums like this one. I have just come from the Porter Royal Commission in Toronto which has been meeting for two years. Environmental groups have had input for two years. They have also been funded to be there because Doctor Porter in his wisdom, and the Ontario Government in their wisdom, decided it was important to make $300,000.00 available to have the public interest represented. In addition, my associates have just gone back to the Cluff Lake Inquiry, Saskatchewan, where the Saskatchewan Government has seen fit to provide $50,000.00 for public interest groups to represent the public interest. We have other precedents where substantial amounts of money were made available to represent the public interest at the Berger Inquiry, which was a federal inquiry. Also, we have the recent example of the Ontario Energy Board, which for the first time in its history, less than two months ago decided to pay intervenors who were there

representing the public interest. In the United States, the State of Main and many other states have for many years seen it as being in the public interest to make sure that public interest groups were adequately funded to representing an alternative view to the view that's being presented at forums like this. In this case I understand Eldorado Nuclear has spent in the neighbourhood of a million dollars to prepare its side of the case. Having spent two years intervening, I can tell you that it cost money just to get here, let alone to hire expert scientists to go through massive reports like the one we have in front of us-- about eleven hundred pages. That has not been available. You have some comment about that, and I just want to add our feeling of tremendous disappointment that the Federal Government has seen fit not to adequately provide for a balanced hearing here. As a result, I think that the two sides will not be heard and I think that will prejudice your findings, unfortunately.

Nuclear program is dying internationally. Two days ago the Globe & Mail section carried an article General Electric-U.S., which is one of the largest builders of nuclear reactors around the world. One of the improvators in the field had not sold one nuclear reactor since 1974. The article also said

that General Electric-U.S. has developed a contingency plan to phase out of the nuclear business within one year if they can't sell any more reactors.

Now, the reason they cannot sell any more reactors is that people do not want them. People around the world do not want them. They are telling their elective representatives that. Some electric representatives are reacting to that reality that political grass roots feeling. Whether it is right or wrong, who really cares if people don't want it. Some governments listen.

The other thing that's happening in the United States is a massive investment in solar energy potential and renewable energies, which this year will approach five hundred million dollars-- protections by major corporations in the United States. Then within ten years several hundreds of millions of dollars will have a market that will be created in solar energy. General Electric and others are investing heavily in these options, which seem to be more acceptable to real people.

Eldorado Nuclear is a Crown corporation. When I think of Crown corporations, being from Ottawa-- that's where I live-- I think of public servants. After all, people who work for a

Crown corporation and are responsible to the Government of Canada for all their actions, are public servants. If they are public servants, they are serving me and all other Canadian taxpayers, but most especially, they are serving those taxpayers directly in the area where they conduct their operations. I do not think that Eldorado Nuclear has served the people of this area very well, in some ways. Sure they have provided jobs, but they have also exploited the environment. Eldorado Nuclear helped contribute to a very unenviable record that Canada has produced in the international journals-- are producing the world's hot spot. That's what it's called, the world's hot spot. It's right near here, Port Hope. The funny thing about Port Hope is nobody knew about it in Canada until the member of the Canadian coalition from Toronto, Mr. Bill Meaden energy probe, convinced the CBC to break a federal law and jump the fence and do radiation readings at Port Hope. Low and behold, the readings were four, five, six hundred times acceptable levels. It was nothing that government agency did to tell us about that risk. There is nothing-- we would not have known about it.

Ten years earlier Professor Andrews, Toronto University, documented the same

evidence, forwarded it to Atomic Energy Control Board, the chairman. It was ignored. Nothing was done. Atomic Energy Control Board, which is represented on your panel, has not fulfilled their mandate in the past and has not given any indication to me, or to a lot of people in Canada that we can have confidence that they will fulfill their mandate in the future. They didn't tell us about the Port Hope situation. They came along after it was discovered by a public interest group.

When I think of what is happening in Ottawa right now-- is that the Federal Government is introducing legislation to curb powers of Crown corporations. I think in your discussions that should be a major issue, what powers do Crown corporations exercise now, will they be curbed, will the public be better protected under the proposed legislation. Being Crown corporation, means that the people of Canada should decide what Crown corporations should do, through the politicians.

I attended part of the hearing's opening night only long enough to see some very misleading and inaccurate charts presented by Eldorado as to uranium reserve. I think that should be an issue, be fully explored. The uranium picture changes almost daily in this country.

Two, three weeks ago Australia came onto the uranium market for the first time ever. Australia being in the market to sell uranium represents an increase in the world potential of around fifty percent which would more than make up for Canada's twelve percent of total uranium in the ground worldwide. Canada could get out of the uranium business and Australia could take it over.

Now, if that decision were taken on moral grounds, or any other grounds, there would be no need for Eldorado Nuclear. There would be no need for this refinery, no need for this storage. I think that should be an issue you should look at, especially in view of the misrepresentations that you have had.

There are locally a number of things at risk. First of all, property values are at risk. The thing that's at risk is long-term health. One thing about radioactivity, that I am sure some of the panel members are aware of it, will agree is that we really do not know what low level long-term radiation does to human beings. Just speculating-- scientists speculate. We don't know what it does. It might shorten life span by ten, fifteen, twenty years.

The Federal Minister of Health and Welfare has recently issued a report which

frightens me a lot. It's about cancer deaths in Canada. It shows that in this country we now lead the world in cancer death areas. The highest group at risk in this country now are young females under the age of thirty-five. We have evidence from the U.S. Cancer Institute which suggests that eighty to ninety percent of cancers are environmentally caused. Those kind of things should be looked at very thoroughly by this group. Local residents are at risk also because of their way of life which is rural, has been a small town, Ontario. The risk of future massive industrial development moving in along with Eldorado.

Now, I am pleased that our friend from Ontario Hydro raised the Darlington issue, because we are talking about the same general area. We have had evidence to the Porter Royal Commission that in view of ACL the best way to use reactors in the future is to surround them with large industrial parks. Now, if that is going to happen then giving approval at this time to one refinery may in fact set a precedent for the next one and the next one and next one. What's at risk most of all for local residents is a complete and utter disregard for the democratic process. For the local residents, in our view, they should have a final veto of whether or not this refinery is installed.

Without being too critical, I know that this panel is composed of six public servants, two professors. Correct me if I am wrong, but there is nobody from this area on the panel. Now, if that is the case I hope that you can develop the kind of empathy as if you had to live here with all of the ramifications that this refinery entails and dump site.

That leads me to my point about the process. We have eleven hundred pages from Eldorado Nuclear. We have not had time to look at it. Local groups have not had a time to look and analyze, to intervene, to have money, to hire scientists for a couple of days-- they are expensive-- to go through this technical report. I understand that one of the last times this panel met in New Brunswick, looking at the Pointe Lepreau Nuclear Reactor, the environmental assessment panel met, federal, and similar criticisms were contained in the final report of that panel that local public interest groups were not given adequate time to intervene, were not given any funding, were not well represented, et caetera, et caetera. It is the same ministry, the Federal Ministry of the Environment, and it's the same situation and it's three or four years later. Unfortunately, therefore, I do not have too much confidence in the process either.

CCNR has made three major briefs at the Porter Commission hearings, and conducted several months of cross-examination of ACL. I have mentioned the amounts of money that have been made available to the public interest. A lot of people think that well, the public interest groups don't need any money. If that's the feeling then I am wasting my time. It's been proven over and over again, as Doctor Ursula Franklin likes to say, most important scientific breakthroughs do not happen in large institutions. She also says that whenever an injustice has been uncovered in the scientific field that it's never been a Crown corporation-- government corporation, regulatory agency that has discovered something that's going wrong. It has always been a private public interest group. I think they perform a valuable function.

There are two final points. One is about jobs. We all like industry creating jobs. Seeing as the federal government set up Eldorado Nuclear to create jobs and to fulfill a need seen at the time, there are other scenarios. It's to create jobs, fulfilling a need for insulating houses, producing renewable energy. Science Council of Canada estimates over the next ten years alone in Eastern Ontario we can create one hundred and seventy thousand jobs in

1 feasibly proven environmentally safe renewable energy
2 technology. The only thing needed is government
3 political will to do so. That is all that is needed to
4 do it. One of the reports that backs it up is from the
5 Environment Canada, Mr. Marshall and his group. They
6 did an assessment of the potential of liquid or
7 methanol fuel. So if they are going to create one
8 hundred and fifty jobs, and I hear that may not be
9 possible because they really transfer one hundred and
10 fifty jobs to the new site from the old site, then I
11 would argue there are cheaper ways for environmentally
12 -- there are nine ways to create one hundred and fifty
13 jobs or more.
14 The final comment is that in part this
15 commision is dealing with the future of this era, the
16 future of Ontario, social structure, ramifications on
17 the future of this kind of development. We are moving
18 into an era that's been characterized by many authors
19 as an era of historical, social change. A time of
20 crises is perceived ahead by the technicians, authors
21 of limits to grow. The people are responding to that
22 in their own life styles by moving away from a squander
23 society and towards a conservative society. I think
24 it's vitally important that this group, this
25 commission look at evidence that's available from the

Science Council of Canada and other places about the future social structure of Canada, and the kind of future that Canadians want. Once again, Environment Canada with its advanced concept centres has prepared excellent reports dealing with possible future. This is an important decision known, not only for this district, but for Ontario and for the process. The federal government has imposed its will on these people, the people in this district when Eldorado moved here. Now, I think it is time for the people to be heard to see if they want to continue to be imposed on. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Connerty. Reg Lang?

MR. LANG: Could you elaborate on the misrepresentation that you are referring to in the uranium figures?

MR. CONNERTY: Yes. If I get a chance to see them again and analyze them. I have had some very recent evidence, and I gave some with regard to Australia now being in the uranium business, which on the world basis changes drastically the world reserves and potential. They were not in the business of selling uranium.

MR. LANG: Are you providing us

with that evidence in whatever brief you are giving us?

MR. CONNERTY: We will be back at the second phase of the hearings. Yes.

MR. LANG: When you said that local residents should have the right to veto a project of this kind, what did you mean by local?

MR. CONNERTY: That's a tough question. Well, where I live, in the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton, some environmental decisions are being made. I think that members of that region should be involved in the decision-- the regional municipality and those who are impacted most within that region should have a larger say. If there are burrows or counties that are impacted more than the whole region, then they should have a larger say in the veto.

MR. LANG: A larger say? A weighted vote?

MR. CONNERTY: A weighted vote.

MR. LANG: Are you talking about in the principle that defines local something like those who are affected by the project?

MR. CONNERTY: Yes.

MR. LANG: What you said a little

earlier was all of the people of Ontario and all the people who were on Lake Ontario and so on.

MR. CONNERTY: That's right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ellan Derow?

MS. DEROW: You mentioned you were coming back in the second phase. One of our problems is information overload. You've mentioned a number of sources that I would really like to see. Could you perhaps in your organization make some of these available to us before the second stage of the hearings, or provide a bibliography?

MR. CONNERTY: Yes.

MS. DEROW: I would really appreciate it.

MR. CONNERTY: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Reg Lang?

MR. LANG: Just one other question. Mr. Grant, in the information you presented on your uranium projects and so on, what was the date of that-- how recent is that information? What was the source? Some of that was taken out of EMR.

MR. GRANT: We have agreed to provide you with a more comprehensive statement with respect to our understanding of the market. If you

recall, we agreed we would do that, and we will do that. I don't have this specific information which you ask for now, but I would rather deal with that in the overall context of how we assess the market. I am very pleased to see that my friend has precisely agreed, as I understand you-- correct me if I am wrong, that he will be providing us with his contrary information concerning reserves before commencement of the next stage.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is one point of clarification I would like to make to your remarks, Mr. Connerty. That is the question of composition of the panel which has been raised. I am sure if you study our process, and a number of other panels also. I did state in my opening remarks that I am quite sure the panel members are still very well committed to it, that we make a report to the Minister of the Environment and make our report. We accept the fact the agencies from which we have been loaned may make different reports. But, we are not representing individual agencies while we are on this panel. I would hope that that can be clearly understood, because in fact some agencies that we are with in normal life have already presented briefs to us that take a different stand from the type of things that we have indicated.

MR. CONNERTY: If I can just respond to that and say that there's a saying in the political spirit that you must know, not only be honest but give the appearance of appearing honest. It seems to me that it becomes harder and harder to convince the average member of the public as defined by law or otherwise, that we have on one hand a bunch of public servants making one representation, we have a panel composing mainly of public servants judging the representations being made by a Crown corporation. All I am suggesting is that you bear that in mind. I would hope that you feel strong enough about it that the appearance is important for future hearings, that perhaps we can change the process of that.

THE CHAIRMAN: I accept your comment, and I assure you we do bear it in mind very heavily. I also was quite interested in your remarks about funding. You did cite specific examples of other agencies. I hope you can elaborate on these and provide them with your brief, or afterwards to our office. This is very useful to us and it will be very helpful. Ellan Derow?

MS. DEROW: I think there is another point of clarification. You said this panel--this particular panel I do not think any member here

served on a previous federal hearing in this particular process. So you mean sort of the process and panel previously constituted. But, these are all different individuals.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any questions from the floor? Mr. Panta.

MR. PANTA: Mr. Chairman, I would like to address my question to Mr. Connerty. Will you agree, sir, with me that when you made that statement the panel has been made up by six federal agents, would you say that generally a meaning that if this gentleman not making the report what government wants, they are losing their job?

MR. CONNERTY: I would be disappointed depending on what they said. I think that's a distinct possibility, because what we are dealing with here is I think a political decision. I feel great sympathy with public servants that are caught in the web created by politicians. You guys may have to take the heat, but it's a political decision to set up Eldorado to allow them to continue their operation. Why not put a couple of politicians on such a panel.

MR. PANTA: In that case, sir, would you tell me that's true that all the politicians

who are in power today have been put in there by us, the public, and they are not representing us the proper way? Just let's be honest about that. I agree with you.

MR. CONNERTY: I do not understand your question.

MR. PANTA: Would you say generally then if the Crown corporation and the federal agent, who is in the panel, six members, you have to report to the politicians, federally or provincially, and that those politicians who assuming they are boss, they will get the report for what they want from them because they don't do that they'll lose their job? In the final analysis those politicians haven't been put in power by us by voting on election time?

MR. CONNERTY: That's right. If the process works at election time, and fortunately you have an election coming up next spring-- now, if you are not satisfied with your local representatives federally you can throw them out.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Connerty, I have one other clarification that may follow along from this. I do not want to get into a long discussion as you indicated you would be back in the

second phase. You did suggest that a possible issue we should look at was the legislation to curb the powers of Crown corporations. My notes indicate that you felt there should be an issue and that politicians should control Crown corporations. As I have heard you talking to Mr. Panta you felt that politicians should not control the decision on whether this refinery should go, but they should control Crown corporations?

MR. CONNERTY: Well, the legislation, as I understand, it gives more discretionary power to the Federal Cabinet with regard to Crown corporations. I have raised it as an issue that I think you should look at. In its historical context of why did the federal government feel the need to introduce such legislation is there any instance in which Eldorado is directly involved as being one of the reasons for the need for tighter controls? That's a context that certainly I think you should look at--that issue.

THE CHAIRMAN: I see. Thank you.

MR. GRANT: What legislation are you talking about, Mr. Connerty?

MR. CONNERTY: What do you mean?

MR. GRANT: Well, you said

government introduced legislation. I just ask you a simple question. What legislation are you talking about?

MR. CONNERTY: I said the government has proposed legislation which would tighten the control on Crown corporations.

MR. GRANT: You thought you said proposals.

MR. CONNERTY: Do I think I said proposal?

MR. GRANT: Do you really mean proposal?

MR. CONNERTY: What did I say?

MR. GRANT: What proposed legislation are you talking about? I am just trying to find out. You are saying it isn't existing legislation. What proposed legislation are you referring to?

MR. CONNERTY: I do not know what it's called, but I read it in the Globe & Mail and I have heard it talked about.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think there is a subtle difference. I think Mr. Connerty is correct that there have been newspaper articles about the possibility of legislation on this subject. I do not

think it has actually been introduced into Parliament as a proposed bill by the government. I think our panel will check on that and find out if there is a proposed legislation in the legal sense that it has been introduced, or it is proposed legislation in the sense that a Cabinet minister may have discussed it, or some other departmental agency has something down the road to introduce.

MR. GRANT: I am still puzzled about the proposed legislation. In what area, Mr. Chairman?

THE CHAIRMAN: My recollection is it grew out of the investigations of Atomic Energy of Canada Limited and the indication of a need for tighter controls. I don't know whether it would apply in the context of Eldorado Nuclear-- in fact I don't know what state it's at. I think we could investigate that further before the next stage of the hearings.

Any other questions from the floor?

MR. GRANT: I have one further question, unless somebody else has one. The name of your organization I understand is the Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility. Is it true that your organization is not so much concerned with responsibility as having no nuclear activity? You are totally against

nuclear activity; is that correct?

MR. CONNERTY: No, that is not correct. One of the interesting misleading statements made by organizations like Eldorado is that in fact we do propose-- we are in fact anti-nuclear.

MR. GRANT: Did you say at the beginning you were an anti-nuclear group, or was that somebody else?

MR. CONNERTY: Well, maybe we are debating a new point here. I think can responsibly try and control the activities of a nuclear energy without asking that every reactor be torn down and carted away. I also think realistically that I would never ask that Ontario Hydro tear down reactors that are in place. Therefore, I cannot be anti-nuclear.

MR. GRANT: Has your organization ever favoured support in favour of a nuclear activity?

MR. CONNERTY: I think I just did.

MR. GRANT: When? Right now?

MR. CONNERTY: Right now.

MR. GRANT: You're in support of not tearing down the Pickering refinery. Have you ever actually presented a brief in support of any nuclear activity?

MR. CONNERTY: I am afraid I do

not speak the same language as you. I do not understand what you're talking about.

MR. GRANT: It is a simple question like was my question about the legislation. I would like to know whether-- if you listen carefully perhaps you can understand. I would like to know whether your organization-- I think you said two hundred affiliated organizations with it-- has your organization ever presented to any body a brief in support of nuclear activity in any form? Do you understand that question?

THE CHAIRMAN: I am sure Mr. Connerty understands it.

MR. GRANT: He said he didn't.

THE CHAIRMAN: That I am sure he can clarify if he hasn't without being prompted by you.

MR. CONNERTY: That's a different question.

THE CHAIRMAN: It's not my question, it's his.

MR. CONNERTY: On your next question-- I am trying to remember if I have ever actually said don't continue with the nuclear placements that exist. Therefore, my answer would have to be, yes, virtually all of the briefs that I have participated in writing have assumed a favourable stand

towards some nuclear activity.

MR. GRANT: Then that's your answer.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. McQuail.

MR. McQUAIL: I am Mr. McQuail.

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry.

MR. McQUAIL: I think perhaps I should clarify. I said CANTDO, the group of people who were involved with CANTDO have taken an increasingly anti-nuclear stand as we have become more aware of the implications of nuclear power from our environment and society. We did not start out with an anti-nuclear and vested interest in being anti-nuclear whatever that really means, but as we have learned more, we have become and are willing to be called an anti-nuclear group. That's why there is a "T" in CANTDO.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any other questions of Mr. Connerty? Thank you, Mr. Connerty. We might proceed to our next speaker who is Chris Beatty. Mr. Connerty, I hope we can have a copy of your brief.

MR.TIMMERMANS: He doesn't have one.

MR. BEATTY: My name is Chris Beatty. I live in the Hope Township. I am a federal

director for south central Ontario for National Campers and Hikers, the world's largest camping association. I have two beefs really tonight. One is with the provincial government and one with the federal government.

I intend to talk about recreation, as you might know it. There are a number of provincial parks in my area, two are on Lake Ontario. One is being Darlington Provincial Park, and another is Pres'Quille. This past week Ontario Natural Resource Minister, Frank Miller, said he would like to see camping fees at provincial parks raised to five, six dollars a day for an unserviced lot. The Ontario Provincial Parks Council suggests the fee be raised to four dollars per day. I would like to suggest to Mr. Miller that he consider the Park Council's recommendations.

Now, we go to Eldorado. Eldorado is known as a Crown corporation. The federal government wish to take some 642 acres of prime agricultural land out of production so it can build a new plant and to extend their dump site at Port Granby. The runoff of water is to go directly to Lake Ontario. The runoff of water in recycling of water could in time pollute Lake Ontario. If this were to happen

Darlington and Pres'Quille provincial parks in my area, also many other provincial parks that front on Lake Ontario, along with many private parks, would be forced to close. There are millions of dollars each year spent on recreational vehicles, trailers, mobile homes, et caetera, et caetera. This would be a blow to the province. There is also millions of dollars spent on camping fees, food, gas and any related thing that goes along with camping.

Mr. Chairman, is there a need? Is the need that great that we have to pollute our land and our waterways while supplying other countries? There are too many questions that cannot be answered.

I would like to see the federal and provincial governments start recycling the spent waste from Port Hope refinery, rather than bury it at Port Granby site as they are doing now. Mr. Chairman, I would like to go on record as being opposed to this new refinery and to the extension of the present dump site. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Reg Lang?

MR. LANG: I was just curious whether you are speaking for yourself or whether you are representing the organization that you mentioned in the beginning.

MR. BEATTY: I am speaking for myself and also the organization which I represent.

MR. LANG: This brief is on behalf of the organization?

MR. BEATTY: On behalf of myself and the organization, yes.

MR. LANG: On behalf of the organization as well as yourself?

MR. BEATTY: Yes.

MR. LANG: How many members are there in that part of your organization that you are referring to, and which area do they cover?

MR. BEATTY: My area is south central Ontario, covers from Ajax to Trenton, and as far north as Peterborough. In fact, it's the great pine ridge tourist area. Now, National Campers and Hikers is the largest family camping association in the world with over seventy thousand members. We have members in Puerto Rico, Germany, Switzerland, and all of the United States, Hawaii, and nine of the provinces of Canada.

MR. LANG: How many in this particular area that you represent?

MR. BEATTY: There is a chapter in Oshawa called the Oshawa Mug Ups that I am their

field director.

MR. LANG: How many members are there?

MR. BEATTY: Approximately twenty-five families.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any questions from the floor?

MR. HILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman. My name is Bob Hill, business manager for the electricians in the Oshawa area affiliated with the Oshawa Building Trades Council.

In reference to the gentleman's remarks here a moment ago-- I do not represent the Oshawa Building Trades Council with my remarks, sir. Personally I used to think that camping was going to be one-- camping and hiking would be a pleasurable event for myself to get away from the cities, whatever. There is garbage on walks-- perhaps the hikers should come before a provincial hearing. In 1969 I, with a group of boy scouts from Port Hope, which is in the area that Eldorado have a plant at the moment, we attempted to take a canoe trip one hundred and forty miles.-- At the end of our camp trip we picked up one complete meal for fourteen people, a full set of clothes for one man.

Now, I wonder if we are saying hikers are going to put more debris on the land, or what are we getting into? Thank you very much.

MR. LANG: While you are at the microphone, you might explain what you're getting at. I do not understand. I am only curious.

MR. HILL: The gentleman I presume represents hikers. Hikers that are doing what? The gentleman is saying that the environment I presume is being disrupted by progress. I am saying, sir, I-- I do not have to be prompted madam-- I am saying that possibly the hikers are making mistakes also that are not being governed by who-- who are we talking about? We are the people doing more damage to the environment than a concern the size of Eldorado that are attempting to prove to this group that they want to do the best for the people involved.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hill, I appreciate your views. It sounds like we could get into a long debate about this.

MR. HILL: We certainly could.

THE CHAIRMAN: Maybe we can stop it right now, unless you have another point or clarification.

MR. HILL: That's the end. Thank

you.

MR. BEATTY: Mr. Chairman, maybe I would like to clarify this gentleman's remarks in a sense that the National Campers and Hikers-- when they go into a park, we leave the park cleaner than when we go into it inasmuch as before the hikers leave the area we instruct our people to go around and clean the lots adjacent to their tents or trailers, whatever. Therefore, as I say, we leave the lots or area far cleaner than when we go in. We've gone down on several camping trips to Prescott Provincial Park and to parks down in east of this area and cleaned up garbage for which we get conservation-- I don't think this gentleman's remarks are put in a very nice way, because the National Campers and Hikers do not litter the land. We in fact, as I say, leave the lands far cleaner when we go out than we go into an area.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am sure our panel is not here to judge whether you do or do not clean up your hiking trails. I think each side has made their point. Perhaps we can ask the next gentleman if he has a point of clarification who is at the mike now.

MR. BEGG: Mr. Chairman--

THE CHAIRMAN: State your name

again, please.

MR. BEGG: My name is Quentin Begg. I am a resident-- take note because it's important-- 15 Centennial Drive, Port Hope.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Begg.

MR. BEGG: We have sat here today and tonight and we have listened. We are using prime-- I quote again that prime agricultural land in the area of Port Hope. My problem is this. If we are using prime agricultural land in Port Hope, I will have-- 15 Centennial Drive, Port Hope, I will have anyone in this hall here-- everyone is welcome to come to my home any time and inspect. I moved into the house four years ago. I have contacted the local contractor to bring me some top soil in the area to my property in Port Hope. To this day I can't grow tomatoes, carrots, nothing in my lot in Port Hope at 15 Centennial Drive. That's prime agricultural land this speaker talked about and all the other speakers talked about. I live at 15 Centennial Drive. Today I went out to try and pick one tomatoe and I couldn't get one. Why doesn't the panel come tomorrow morning and see?

THE CHAIRMAN: Just a minute, Mr. Begg. Mr. Begg, I assure you I have trouble with my tomatoes too. I just want to clarify. Is your

point that you feel Eldorado is responsible for this or Eldorado is not responsible for this?

MR. BEGG: No way. I would like to clarify one point. Through the whole hearings, we are talking about prime agricultural land in Port Hope. Well, I don't get any and I live in Port Hope.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Begg. Are there any other questions?

MR. PANTA: Mr. Chairman, I have to apologize. I do not want to be speaker all the time, but a few questions has been raising on each speaker's statement. I would like to clarify those for my own information also, as for the panel I hope as well.

Mr. Beatty, can you just give me a brief note on that-- how much money personally have you invested in the local park recreational area-- what you mentioned?

MR. BEATTY: I do not know just what the speaker means in a sense of local parks or moneys invested. By me personally or--

MR. PANTA: You mentioned the local park area is close to the Eldorado Nuclear waste disposal. I think so you mentioned the park name was Darlington. Do you have any personal investment in

that park at all?

MR. BEATTY: In answer to that, I myself don't have any personal investment, but our members are-- that are travelling through this area use that park, not only from all parts of Canada, but the United States also. This is the only interest that I have in that particular park, or any park that fronts on Lake Ontario or has access to our super highways.

MR. PANTA: The only reason I wanted to know that, is because I wanted to know if you're prejudiced on your own private interest like I am, local resident. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there are no further questions, I have one of Eldorado in connection with the questions that have come up during this first three days. Are you in a position to give an indication when these could be made available? I think we discussed this last night--

MR. GRANT: You mean the answers to the questions?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. GRANT: I hope we understand all the questions. It will probably take several more sessions to deal with some of the things--

SPEAKER IN THE AUDIENCE: Speak

1 up.

2 MR. GRANT: What we propose to do,

3 as I understand our discussions with the secretary of

4 the panel this morning, is to deal at some depth at the

5 end of next Thursday with quite a list of questions.

6 Also I understand that the panel directly would like to

7 put questions to us, which may not have been raised by

8 those persons presenting briefs at this time. We

9 indicated that we will have written response to the

10 radiological stuff from Health and Welfare in written

11 form before Tuesday. We don't propose to introduce any

12 more-- any answers tonight. I do not think there is

13 time to do it.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: No. I agree. I

15 just wanted to clarify the information we could expect

16 next week.

17 MR. GRANT: We certainly would

18 appreciate if you have any questions-- any written

19 questions that we may not have made a note of, to have

20 sufficient time to be able to deal with them, whenever

21 you want us to deal with them. It sometimes takes time

22 to answer them.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Agreed. If there

24 are no further questions, we can then reconvene Tuesday

25 evening at Newcastle Town Hall at 7:00 p.m. We will

adjourn until then.

--- ADJOURNED AT 10:00 P.M.

CERTIFIED CORRECT

Lynda Johansson
Lynda Johansson

FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT BOARD

Sitting in the Town Hall, Newcastle,
Ontario on OCT 4 1977

VOLUME 4

Nethercut & Co. Ltd.,
Official Reporters
44 York Street
Toronto, Ontario
M5J 1R4

Nethercut & Co. Ltd.
Toronto, Ontario

FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT BOARD

BEFORE:

MR. J. S. KLENAVIG	Chairman
MR. K. SHIKAZE	Member
DR. P. M. BIRD	Member
MR. M. DUNCAN	Member
DR. ELLAN DEROW	Member
MR. M. C. CHENG	Member
DR. D.P. SCOTT	Member
MR. R. S. LANG	Member

MR. M. WARDER	Acting Secretary
MR. B. TIMMERMANS	Public Participaction Officer

Sitting in the Town Hall
Newcastle, Ontario, on
Tuesday, October 4, 1977.

APPEARANCES:

MR. C. GRANT	Counsel for Eldorado Nuclear
MR. D. FROST	Representative for Eldorado Nuclear
MR. G. COLBOURNE	Representative for Eldorado Nuclear

VOLUME 4

INTERVENORS:

MR. MICHAEL WLADYKA	Mayor of Port Hope
MRS. DORA NICHOLS	Citizen
MRS. SHIRLEY EAMES	Port Hope Chamber of Commerce
MRS. ROSEMARY TISNOVSKY	Citizen
MR. ROBERT DYKSTRA	Citizen
MR. BILL PEDEN	Ryerson Environmental Centre
MR. HENRY LISE	Citizen

Nethercut & Company Limited,
Official Reporters,
44 York Street, Toronto, Ont.

Per: C. Denman

--- Upon commencing at 7:00 p.m.

THE CHAIRMAN: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. We seem to have a little competition with the bowling league. I don't know if you can suffer through this evening. My name is John Klenavig and I am the Chairman of the Environmental Assessment Panel. I opened the first phase at Bowmanville last Tuesday evening with a fifteen minute speech and propose just to touch on it for the benefit of those who may not have been present before, but also to save those that have been, I will be brief. The other reason I would like to be brief at this time is that we have eight other speakers on this evening's agenda and it will be a long evening.

As I mentioned these hearings started in Bowmanville last week and the panel is preparing a report to the Ministry of Environment concerning the Eldorado proposal. Our report will contain recommendations based on whether the project should proceed as proposed, should proceed with modifications or not proceed at all. Our purpose in this phase of the hearings is threefold. It is to clarify the points that may not be understood in the Environmental Impact Statement, to identify the deficiencies in that, and, finally, to identify the concerns of the project. The panel following this phase will identify the

deficiencies in EIS or the Environmental Impact Statement and the issues. These will be made public and after the proponent, Eldorado, has rectified deficiencies, and there has been an opportunity to study the results, the second phase of our hearings will begin.

This second phase will be a technical phase with respect to specific issues assigned to specific days. This will allow all parties to have discussions, to discuss the subjects on the day scheduled, so to allow the public that are interested in specific questions, to ask questions of the experts.

Coming back to this phase, following my remarks and introduction by Eldorado, we have asked that the intervenors speak for 15 minutes or less followed by questions by the panel and the public, which I would like to emphasize at directed at clarifying what the speaker has said and not as presenting other points of view, which is the object of our second phase hearings.

To those are not familiar with the earlier hearings, I might point out that the federal and provincial agencies have prepared technical reviews of the Environmental Impact Statement. These are available. If time permits this evening at the

end of the sessions, we welcome anyone who wishes to speak, but is not formally registered, or perhaps has prepared a brief to do so. Please see Mr. Timmermans on your left to register for this.

We have also received a number of letters and briefs from individuals and organizations which will not be making a formal presentation at these hearings. However, these and future submissions are welcomed and will be considered by the panel in their deliberations. Copies of these are also available for those interested.

We have established a new information office at the Flying Dutchman Hotel until Thursday evening. After that any information can be obtained from our office. Our hearings will continue from 1:30 to 5:00 p.m. tomorrow and 7:00 to 10:00 tomorrow as well. Thursday we will be starting at 10:00 in the morning until noon then 1:30 to 5:00 and then 7:00 till 10:00. The last part of Thursday evening has been reserved for any questions the panel may have of Eldorado which are of interest to these hearings. I have the following speakers scheduled for this evening. A brief overview by Eldorado which will bring us up to date, the Mayor of Port Hope, the Township of Hope, Ms. Dora Nichols, the Port Hope Chamber of Commerce - Mrs. Shirley Eames, Rosemary

Tisnovsky of Port Granby, Mrs. D. Boisvert of Newtonville, Robert Dykstra and Mr. Bill Peden from Toronto.

We are using a court reporter who is located to your right. In order that we can all be heard please use the microphone and identify yourselves so the transcript that is being made can accurately record who is speaking.

I would like to introduce the panel. On my right is Ellan Derow. By her is Murray Duncan. In the centre is Peter Bird and on the far end is Kim Shikaze. Starting on the far side we have Reg Lang, then David Scott and Clem Cheng. To my left is Michael Warder who is our Panel Secretary and who is in Room 112 in the Flying Dutchman Hotel for any further information during the day. In addition on your left is our public participation officer, Brian Timmermans, who is also available for questions and there is a table for the intervenors speaking. You can sit down and speak from there. The microphone in the centre is for people who may be asking questions. On your right side in front of the screen we have the representatives of Eldorado. The table up the back raised on high are representatives of the media. I think I have covered everything. There may be a few questions and we might clarify them at the

break. So, I would ask Eldorado now to give us a brief update. Mr. Grant?

MR. GRANT: Mr. Chairman, I see many faces here today who I've seen at previous hearings. We have decided not to proceed with our slide presentation and the overview which we presented at the original hearings. I feel confident that those people here will have had an opportunity of either visiting one or more of the information centres and almost certainly feel they would have received a copy of the Eldorado publication entitled "The Port Granby Plan". We, of course, will be happy to deal with any questions put to Eldorado concerning the detailed construction of the refinery, but in order to expedite matters this evening, in view of the number of speakers, I thought I would simply provide to the panel some additional information which we have and were able to put together in response to certain questions which were raised at earlier sessions.

You may recall, sir, that last week there was some discussion as to the source of our information relating to the comments which were made by Eldorado officials as to the uranium resources and uranium demands both in Canada and elsewhere in the world.

We have prepared and I have provided

to the panel and to Mr. Timmermans a number of copies of our response to that enquiry. The information in this material is derived basically from two sources as noted in the first page and the subsequent page. The principal source is a presentation made to a world energy conference held in Istanbul in September of this year and a submission made to that conference by Atomic Energy Control Limited and the Federal Department of Energy Mines and Resources, a submission entitled "The Contribution of Nuclear Power To World Energy Supplies". The second is the 1976 assessment of Canadian uranium supply and demand, report EP77-3, June of this year, published by Energy, Mines and Resources.

A lot of back-up and supporting material with respect to the matter stated in the paper which we have filed will be found in either or both of those sources. The second material we have filed in response to your requests last week is a paper dealing with some of our considerations as to the environmental monitoring program which would be introduced and undertaken during the course of construction and during the operation of the refinery itself.

I would make one comment or caveat with respect to this particular paper and that is to

underline and emphasize that the actual detailed nature of monitoring which is to be undertaken by Eldorado either before or during the construction of the refinery is a matter very much in the regulatory authority of two agencies, the Atomic Energy Control Board and the Ministry of Environment, both of which have a great deal to say about the kinds of monitoring programs and measures which will be undertaken by Eldorado. I mention this because in some instances in this paper we indicate that certain steps will probably be taken. In particular, I am concerned that these kinds of comments are not interpreted as meaning that no steps will be taken or anything of that sort. We just do not feel it is appropriate to commit ourselves to the course of monitoring which would not be acceptable to the Ontario Ministry of Environment or the Atomic Energy Control Board itself.

Those two papers I have submitted, and we can make additional copies available although I don't know what copying facilities we have here.

The last matter I would like to mention is that last week at the conclusion of our meeting it was hoped we would have available for your consideration a detailed response to the briefs submitted to you by the Federal Department of Health and Welfare. You may recall that we indicated at that

time that at a preliminary glance the material provided by the Federal Department of Health and Welfare gave us approximately 32 comments to make on roughly 54 critiques or comments on ourselves. We are not quite finished our comments yet and we expect that we will have these available in a written form before the end of the week. Our concern is some of the questions asked for information could be broader than we interpreted and we would like to ensure that we have understood the questions correctly by communications with the proper officials of Health and Welfare.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, I don't think I have anything further to add except to say that over in the corner there we have brought to the meeting this evening one of the models we have made which shows the topographic picture of the property that was owned by Eldorado and shows the proposed location of the refinery building itself on the property. One should not interpret or look at that building as being precisely what the building would look like when completed. It is simply a rough architectural approximation of the volume of the building that would be located in the area. But as far as the topography is concerned, my information is that it is pretty accurate and reflects what in fact is

there.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Grant. Our first speaker this evening is Michael Wladyka, the Mayor of Port Hope.

MR. WLADYKA: Ladies and gentlemen of the Assessment Panel, I have with me here a short statement which I prepared during the past few weeks and which was endorsed unanimously by the Port Hope Municipal Council at our regular meeting last night. I have been very interested in the proposal that has been made since any move by Eldorado, any direction would affect Port Hope in many ways. I have, since January the 7th, when the announcement was made that there will be an information centre set up in Port Hope, I have made it a point to visit that information centre on many occasions and have availed myself of all the information I could possibly find, because I am interested in the environment.

I am also interested in what happens to Eldorado, and for these reasons I have prepared this following statement.

SUBMISSION BY MAYOR MICHAEL WLADYKA

Mr. John Klenavic - Chairman and Members of the Environmental Assessment Panel, Ladies and Gentlemen:

This hearing concerns itself with the potential environmental impact of the proposed Port Granby project of Eldorado Nuclear Limited.

There is no community, in Canada, that has been more closely associated with the operations of Eldorado Nuclear, than the Town of Port Hope. A very large segment of Port Hope's 9,877 population comprises of the work force of Eldorado Nuclear. Since the establishment of the Eldorado Mining and Refining Company in Port Hope in the early 1930's, the work force has grown and we now have Eldorado employees lining on almost every street of Port Hope. As citizens of Port Hope, they concern themselves with the environmental impact of the Eldorado Nuclear operations in Town as much as, or even more so than any other citizen. It may, therefore, be of some importance to this hearing to learn that the Council of the Town of Port Hope supported the actions of Atomic Energy Control Board in granting a six month extension to Eldorado Nuclear's licence to operate the Port Granby Residue Are, on January 24th, 1977. The Port Hope Town Council passed the following resolution on February 7th, 1977, by a unaminous vote: moved by Reeve V.A. Vosburgh and seconded by

Councillor C.B. Locke

"Be it resolved that:

Whereas the Council of the Town of Port Hope in fully aware of the major contribution in human resources, employment of fixcal benefits to this community made by Eldorado Nuclear Limited.

And, Whereas nuclear energy is of vital importance in the face of critical energy shortages in Canada,

And, Whereas Eldorado Nuclear Limited is co-operating to the fullest extent to meet Atomic Energy Control Board requirements for future storage and monitoring of radioactive waste materials,

Be it therefore resolved that:

(1) The Council of the Town of Port Hope supports the actions taken by the Atomic Energy Control Board Commission in providing the six months extension of the licence for Eldorado Nuclear and allowing them to undertake and plan further improvements and safeguards in the

"storing and monitoring of their waste materials;

(2) The Council of the Town of Port Hope supports Eldorado Nuclear's plans for a new refinery and processing plant in the Town of Newcastle."

This was carried and signed Michael Wladyka - Mayor

In July, 1977, the Town of Port Hope received a number of copies of the three (3) volume report prepared by two (2) independent consulting companies, James F. MacLaren and Hydrology Consultants Limited of Toronto.

The contents of the report is full of highly scientific and technical information on the proposed Port Granby Uranium Refinery and wass prepared by knowledgeable persons in each field of study. Guidelines for the Environmental Impact Study were issued by a steering committee, which included representatives of the Ontario and Federal Environmental Ministries and the Atomic Energy Control Board of Canada.

It is, therefore, reasonable to assume, that an independent study by experts under the guidelines of both Provincial and Federal Ministries of Health, will be unbiased, factual and constructively critical.

The cost to Eldorado Nuclear of this 18 month study is close to one million dollars. It is money well spent, in that the total proposed operation has come under minute scrutiny. It will enable Eldorado to proceed, if all approvals are given, with the knowledge that, from Environmental Impact considerations, they have left nothing to conjecture.

Eldorado Nuclear operations in Port Hope have been confined and difficult in an urban area where planned expansion is almost impossible.

Eldorado Nuclear belongs to all of Canada and not only to Port Hope. During this energy crisis it is all the more important, the expansion of Eldorado Nuclear activities be on a site environmentally suitable and of a size that it will provide sufficient "exclusion zone" or buffer for maximum protection and peace of mind.

At the most recent meeting of the Port Hope Council, it was unanimously agreed that the position taken in the February 7th, 1977 resolution is unchanged and we support Eldorado Nuclear's plans for the Refinery at Port Granby.

Presented on behalf of the Port Hope Municipal Council. Respectfully submitted Mayor Michael Wladyka.

Now, if I may add to that, we made it a point to encourage as many people as possible to visit the information centre. We had invited and had visitations from members of the Toronto School Board. We had members and visitations from principals and vice-principals in the Newcastle and Northumberland district. We had visitations from people who were interested in seeing for themselves what the operation looked like, people who want to have peace of mind and know that everything has been done to protect the environment, but also to seek out the answers to problems which may crop up.

We take the attitude that if there is darkness, you don't run away from it. You pierce through the darkness. You try to bring the light there. I might say at this time when the world is crying for energy to solve the world problems, we must take into consideration both the environmental impact and also the impact on how to make the world a better place to live for more people, not just Canadians in Canada but also people all over the world who need that energy. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: As I mentioned in my opening remarks, questions should be aimed at clarifying what the intervener said and not taking any other positions. Are there any questions from the panel?

MR. LANG: I have a couple of questions. You say at the very beginning that you see this project will have considerable effects on the Town of Port Hope. Could you explain what you mean? What kind of effects do you mean? What do you see as the main effects?

MAYOR WLADYKA: Well, we have lived with Eldorado since 1932 and from the point of economics, the input of Eldorado into the community as far as human resources is concerned touches on every facet of community life. We have Eldorado employees who have served on all our commissions, school boards, the Children's Aid Society, the Cancer Society, you name it. The Eldorado people have been working there as part of our community. A loss of that manpower in our community would be something that could not be replaced very easily.

Secondly, the input, the financial input, is something that cannot be replaced. If we took that out of Port Hope we would have a very depressed area. We have an area where a community, the downtown area would certainly find it difficult to recover from a blow such as that. Environmentally we have watched Eldorado do everything we have asked them to to give maximum protection as they see it.

Now, we had a great scare in Port Hope

when the world media practically directed or zeroed in on Port Hope with respect to such things as radon gas. The local people of Port Hope even as late as yesterday came in to put a petition for a change of name. They suggested that they are not interested in moving. They simply want to get away from any ill effects of bad publicity. We believe what Eldorado has done to encourage a safe environment has been even greater than most people would have asked them to do.

MR. LANG: That is an interesting preamble, but I would like to now get down to the question. I would like to know what effects you expect this project would have. We are not discussing whether or not anything would be taken out of Port Hope. We are discussing whether a new plant will be built in Port Granby and under what conditions.

What do you expect will happen in Port Hope as a result of the refinery being built in Port Granby?

MAYOR WLADYKA: Well, first of all, what we would expect is no loss in what we already have. We feel they will not move out and that they will be close to and still support Port Hope in every way possible. We also feel that the Port Granby plant will benefit Port Hope from this point of view.

They will be working in the area and make more use of the waterfront, blocking us out from the lake and things of that sort. I think all things work for the good if given enough time and enough thought.

MR. LANG: I want to ask another question. In the middle of your brief it seems the message is that you are assuming that given the environmental assessment, that if that is approved, environmental effects will be at least inconsequential. There won't be much to worry about. I'm wondering first of all whether that is a correct message I am getting.

MAYOR WLADYKA: I would say, yes, from this point of view. The Port Hope people are both provincial taxpayers and federal taxpayers and we are very encouraged that Environment Canada is supervising the actions taken. We are very encouraged that the provincial Ministry of the Environment is interested because as taxpayers of Port Hope and the rest of Canada we feel that they are doing or should be doing a good job to protect all of the interests from the environmental point of view.

MR. LANG: Well, Are you placing your faith in the Ministry as being able to minimize the impact? Are you basing that on your own experience

in Port Hope with the government?

MAYOR WLADYKA: Well, our own experience with Eldorado in all the years that we have been dealing with Eldorado, we haven't had a problem as far as the environment is concerned. Any time we have discussed anything with Eldorado -- and certainly they have invited us to discuss any problems where they might see something that might affect an area in Port Hope.

MR. LANG: So, you are satisfied with your experiences from the existing refinery. It is quite important because you have the experience with the refinery. I am trying to find out whether you, as the Mayor, or a representative of Council, is satisfied that the company and the governments have done everything they can to keep the environmental impact to a safe minimum level.

MAYOR WLADYKA: Well, I would say that there is always room for improvement no matter what you do and I am very pleased to see Eldorado is spending a million dollars on this in 18 months of time and energy to get this. I feel no one is ever perfect, but I think up to this point in time they have certainly cooperated to the fullest extent and the people of Port Hope are happy with the operation of Eldorado in Port Hope.

MR. SHIKAZE: Have you yourself or your staff reviewed the sections that deal with the labour force and the construction? What I am concerned about is have you looked at the Environmental Impact Statement from the standpoint of the impact that the construction workers and the labour force might have on the Town of Port Hope? Do you feel that a proper assessment has been made with respect to the facilities Port Hope has for accommodating any extra increase that may result?

MAYOR WLADYKA: We have looked after that point. All the people who are going to be engaged in the construction of the plant will not be necessarily living in Port Hope. We are looking at a situation very similar to the west of the project where people, the work force will be drawn from various areas and there may be an impact, but certainly nothing like what happened in the Cornwall area during the building of the Hydro plant where it was a tremendous influx of opportunists, places set up and then sold for mortgages. I think lessons have been learned from that kind of operation and I don't foresee that kind of problem in Port Hope.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any questions from the public?

DR. BIRD: Mr. Mayor, I have a

question, two questions in fact. The resolution which was passed by Council in January, I wonder if you could tell us to what extent the content of that resolution was made public to the people of Port Hope, because we have had some indication that there are some individuals at least in Port Hope who don't exactly share the view that you have expressed. I am wondering if there was any reaction from the town people on the passage of the resolution.

MAYOR WLADYKA: It was widely publicized in the local newspapers. Our Council Meetings are completely open and our Committee meetings are open to the press and public. They are supplied with copies of all our correspondence and everything else. I feel that everyone in Port Hope who has been interested in the project in any way certainly has had ample opportunity to bring forward before Council their opinions. I might say that there hasn't been a single delegation to Council opposing this proposal.

DR. BIRD: My second question is slightly more general. Supposing it were the recommendation of this Panel and subsequently action was taken that led to the decision of the location of the new refinery to be somewhere else? What would be the view of your Council of Port Hope with respect to that?

MAYOR WLADYKA: From the Port Hope point of view, from the Council point of view, we would feel that rather than it being a loss to the area, as I say a loss of human resources as well as a financial loss from taxation and other benefits that come to the given area -- mind you, if it goes to Granby, we are in Port Hope and are not going to benefit from it as far as any benefits accrued to the municipality are concerned, and therefore, we have no reason for supporting Port Granby or the other side. Maybe it would be better on the other side of the line, maybe it would affect us and benefit our financial structure. What we are looking at here, looking at the point of view of long term benefits, and we realize the cost -- one of the reasons why this site was chosen above others is that certain costs are involved in transporting material to and from the area. Certainly, if you put it in some remote area, the environmental impact would be greater. If we put it among our native people in the north, you would not have as many people looking after the day to day operation as you would have people there. I know in the north country even to get a doctor or dentist or nurse to stay you have to compensate them to a greater degree. So, when you come to the people in the field of science you have to

have them looking to an area close to the activities, Toronto and other places.

THE CHAIRMAN: The gentleman in the red shirt that wanted to speak, would you go to a microphone now? You can use the microphone in the centre, please.

MR. EADES: I live three-quarters of a mile here on Lot 206 Plan 173. Now, this question I notice, Mr. Mayor, that you were interested in the impact, the environmental impact this would have on Port Hope and a little later you mentioned the unfortunate experience you had with radon gas. Now, would you please tell us whether it was Eldorado, whether it was the Atomic Energy Control Board, or whether it was someone else who brought in the unfortunate news to Port Hope.

MAYOR WLADYKA: I might say that the operation in Port Hope began ---

MR. EADES: I am asking you a question.

MAYOR WLADYKA: Right.

MR. EADES: Whether it was Eldorado ---

MAYOR WLADYKA: You want a yes or no?

MR. EADES: I want to know whether it was Eldorado, the Atomic Energy Control Board or

someone else who brought the radon gas to your attention.

MAYOR WLADYKA: It could have started before Eldorado came into the picture. Eldorado came into the picture in 1944 as a crown corporation.

MR. EADES: That isn't answering the question.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think we are getting off the subject which is to clarify the brief that we have received.

MR. EADES: He mentioned the radon gas and that is my question.

THE CHAIRMAN: Perhaps that question should be directed to technical people.

MR. EADES: If you want to know, I can tell you. It wasn't Eldorado. It wasn't the Atomic Energy Control Board. It was someone else.

A CITIZEN: Who was it?

THE CHAIRMAN: We have a few more questions from the panel. Ellan Derow?

DR. DEROW: Yes. On page 2 you pointed out that the Atomic Energy Control Board granted a six month extension to the licence at Port Granby. Now, six months has come and gone.

MAYOR WLADYKA: Yes, this was the position that was taken at the time that the application

was made and it was pointed out at that time that the Port Hope Counsel supported the actions of the Atomic Energy Control Board in granting the extension to Eldorado. The position at that time where they supported the Eldorado Port Granby refinery project has not changed. They still support it. The position of the Port Hope Council remains unchanged and it was unanimously agreed that the extension would continue to operate in the residue area. What we refer to there, the residue area, was actually operated in Port Granby. Today we look at it from the point of view that if the total operation is operating on a very large site where a planned expansion of the operation takes place, they will have far better control of residue and waste materials than they have had in the Port Hope operation where they really didn't have any place to put the controls.

DR. DEROW: What I don't understand is why you supported the Atomic Energy Control Board in this extension. Why were they called upon?

MAYOR WLADYKA: Well, we used that because it was the only control board who at that time had the power to issue -- Mr. Spence I think it was -- who had the power to extend the licence.

DR. DEROW: On what basis is the licence extended?

MAYOR WLADYKA: The licence extends for six months.

DR. DEROW: On what basis is that extension given?

MAYOR WLADYKA: Based on the fact that Eldorado met all the necessary requirements as set forth by the Atomic Energy Control Board.

DR. DEROW: And after six months was it extended?

MAYOR WLADYKA: It would be reviewed.

DR. DEROW: And what happened?

MAYOR WLADYKA: I think they thought -- well they were given the extension.

DR. DEROW: You didn't support it again?

MAYOR WLADYKA: We supported it again.

DR. DEROW: Every time?

MAYOR WLADYKA: The second time?

DR. DEROW: Yes.

MAYOR WLADYKA: Well, we went on record the first time and there was no need for us to do it --

DR. DEROW: I am trying to get at why you had to do it the first time.

MAYOR WLADYKA: Because we feel that the Atomic Energy Control Board was correct in giving

the extension.

DR. DEROW: Why did you do it the second time?

MAYOR WLADYKA: The second time it went through as a routine matter. We didn't feel our support was really required or necessary.

DR. DEROW: I see. Thank you.

MR. DUNCAN: Mr. Mayor, just to pursue this similar kind of point, on page 3 you talked about:

"The Council of the Town of Port Hope supports the actions taken by the Atomic Energy Control Board Commission..."

You might explain this relationship a little bit more closely between the Town of Port Hope and Newcastle so we can get a better impression of the significance of this point because I still don't understand it.

MAYOR WLADYKA: The Town of Port Hope has been actually the centre of operations of the Refinery from the very outset. When the residue area was chosen it was before there was a change, before there was a regionalization, before the regional government came in. We were dealing with another municipality at that time. At the present moment what was marked for Newcastle, the Town of Newcastle in the new regional government structure. So, we refer

to the Town of Newcastle and we are actually referring to a municipality in which Port Granby finds itself.

MR. DUNCAN: But this didn't occur since February 1977?

MAYOR WLADYKA: Pardon?

MR. DUNCAN: This change in status did not occur prior to 1977?

MAYOR WLADYKA: No, it doesn't change now.

MR. DUNCAN: So, right now the Town of Port Hope is a part of, the regional part of the municipality which is called the Town of Newcastle?

MAYOR WLADYKA: We are part of Northumberland County. We are still a separate town. We haven't gone through the restructuring process, although we are getting very close to it. We have a county structure in the area which may change the boundaries slightly, but they are not changing Port Hope. Port Hope will stay as Port Hope and there won't be a change in the structure of Port Hope.

MR. DUNCAN: Really, the connection between the town and the proposed refinery is very much a spin-off affair as far as your interest in the refinery is concerned.

MAYOR WLADYKA: That's right. There will be no direct benefit for Port Hope to have a

refinery in Port Granby except that we will get the spin-off of the benefits.

MR. DUNCAN: Finally, on page 4, you say in the second paragraph:

"It is, therefore, reasonable to assume that an independent study by experts under the guidelines of both provincial and federal Ministries of Health, will be unbiased, factual and constructively critical."

I thought this was related back to the occupational health considerations, but I don't want to pursue that. In your opinion, Mr. Mayor, how do you relate Eldorado Nuclear's proposed refinery then to Canada's role in the total energy picture considering that the refinery has not made any assumptions for export, how do you view this, because in many instances you support or you provide a back-up from your comments by referring to the energy crisis worldwide in Canada. Is there any clarification or any distinction between the two and just how do you relate it?

MAYOR WLADYKA: Well, I think of the energy need as being global and in Canada in particular when I pick up the latest bulletin concerning the forecast for costs of municipal electrical power, it

frightens me. I wonder how long our industries will be able to continue before they will simply have to fold up and try other places to carry on manufacturing.

The only segment that produces or generates income in Canada are the industries. All other segments, whether they be educational, governmental or otherwise, are people who generate expenses. So, from the point of view of how can we encourage our industries to be competitive and to provide Canadians with jobs which are vitally needed, and how are we going to do this if our energy costs are prohibitive, or if we simply haven't got the energy to do so? I think that Eldorado has been one of the areas that we should be looking at to solve our energy problem.

We believe that there is such a thing as possibilities from the solar field. Certainly it is going to take a little time, but this would be supplementary. We do believe there is a real benefit to be derived for all Canadians and probably people in other countries who buy products of nuclear energy.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have a question of clarification from Mrs. Lawson.

MRS. LAWSON: Mr. Mayor, did you say that Eldorado had actively encouraged a safe

environment in the Town of Port Hope?

MAYOR WLADYKA: Yes, I did.

MRS. LAWSON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to lend you for the remainder of this week a document that has some evidence of what has happened to this town over the past two years. There are a good many citizens of the Town of Port Hope who do not share the Mayor's views.

MAYOR WLADYKA: Could you give me a percentage?

THE CHAIRMAN: As I said, the Mayor has made a statement and we are not interested in this stage whether he is right or not. People are wanting to speak. Could you give that to Mr. Timmermans, please, I have run out of space.

MR. BILL PATTON: Bill Patton from Newcastle. Mr. Mayor, in your statement you said as Mayor of Port Hope and that you have been constantly watching over Eldorado Nuclear very carefully in the last many years, would you please tell me what power you have in watching over them, regulatory powers or such other powers?

MAYOR WLADYKA: No regulatory power, but the power of communication, the power of exchange of ideas. As I mentioned earlier in my brief, a very high percentage of people who live in Port Hope are

Eldorado Nuclear employees. They are people who participate in activities in all facets of Port Hope life. We are able to communicate. If we see a problem arising, we are able to go either to the manager or to many of their employees who are neighbours and bring the matter to their attention. These are people who are chemical engineers and people that are scientists in their fields and if there is a problem -- are you pointing out any particular problem?

MR. PATTON: Well, I would like to know what yourself today as Mayor can do when the cattle have been dying on the ground ---

MAYOR WLADYKA: You say that? There was no cow died....

THE CHAIRMAN: There may be an issue here which we can discuss later. I don't think bringing it up now is going to provide any better answer.

MR. PATTON: Thank you. I accept your comments but that was in the speech to say watching over and they are doing something wrong. If I point something myself I have to go to them and rectify it and I am asking what he as a man did and what happened from Eldorado Limited.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

A CITIZEN: I live near Belleville. In

your speech you mentioned that Eldorado were building at Port Granby and exporting to other countries. Myself, I feel it is not good for Canada and I wish you could explain to me why or how it is good for other countries, especially underdeveloped countries.

MAYOR WLADYKA: I didn't say Eldorado is good for other countries. I said energy is good for all countries as a global need everywhere. If I could expand on that, I would like to say if we are going to solve the world problem for the world, it has to be with energy. For instance, the Sahara Desert cannot be tapped by anything else other than energy. You cannot grow a fertile area without irrigation or the means to get energy to bring that about. So, what I said, energy is a worldwide need and Eldorado may be a means through its nuclear program of solving some of the energy problems.

A CITIZEN: Okay, thank you. I thought you were referring to all energy problems and referring only to nuclear energy.

MAYOR WLADYKA: There is a difference of opinion on it, but I say any kind of energy, and I would be the first one who would like to see more work done in the solar energy field, and what is feasible and possible, and what we could do. As a matter of fact, if anyone could do it, more power to

them.

THE CHAIRMAN: We still have seven more speakers scheduled. Do we have a question for clarification?

MRS. CLARKE: You are worried about the people from Port Hope. What about the people of Port Granby? Mr. Lang has asserted that is what it is for.

MAYOR WLADYKA: I am just worried about the people in Port Granby and if I was living in Port Granby today I would do exactly what I have done in Port Hope and in Port Hope we have lived with the Eldorado, the people of Eldorado have been part of our community, and we have done especially well.

MRS. CLARKE: Yes, you are already committed in Port Hope. We have chosen not to be committed in Port Granby.

MAYOR WLADYKA: That hasn't anything to do with the environment.

MRS. CLARKE: It has to do with these hearings.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there are no further questions, I think we will move to the next speaker. Mr. Gemblett? Good evening.

MR. GEMBLETT: Thank you. Do you feel in Port Hope if this was built, do you feel that

Eldorado can act quickly and with competence when spills take place?

MAYOR WLADYKA: We have had no nuclear accident so to speak in Port Hope in all the years I can recall. We had a problem that arose from a case of uranium that created radon. This was something that was the outcrop of something that could have happened long before the work of Eldorado. In sites that have been excavated and looked at, they are still debating, the owners of those properties, when that was.

MR. GEMBLETT: If I could clarify the situation, I was talking more of a liquid upset or spill at the plant itself.

MAYOR WLADYKA: Are you aware of any?

MR. GEMBLETT: Are you aware of any spills?

MAYOR WLADYKA: I haven't heard of any spills.

MR. GEMBLETT: Are you aware of any spills?

MAYOR WLADYKA: Did you get that from the newspaper?

MR. GEMBLETT: Are you aware of any spills that have actually entered the water?

THE CHAIRMAN: I am having trouble

seeing how that dialogue affects the Mayor's paper. I think we better get back on with the discussion.

Our next speaker is the Township of Hope. Is the Township of Hope here? I think we will pass to our next speaker, Mrs. Dora Nichols.

MRS. NICHOLS: Ladies and gentleman, Mr. Chairman and members of the Panel. It is Mrs. Dora Nichols.

Clarence and I, with our two sons, James and Timm, wish to voice our opposition to the proposed expansion of the nuclear dump so close to our property and also our objections to the proposed new refinery on this land zoned for agriculture.

We own the north half of lots 1 and 2 Broken Front, both south halves are now owned by the Eldorado Crown Corporation. We also rent another 210 acres in the immediate area, so we feel our family business of farming is being threatened by this uranium refinery and expanded dump site.

Since we have a large dairy operation and pasture approximately 150 animals during the grazing season, of which 55 are milking cows, we feel that there would definitely be effluent falling on their forage from the refinery smoke stacks, (if the one in Port Hope is any example), and they would be drinking from the polluted streams and creeks.

Who really knows where the underground streams are?

Milk from the dairy cow is very susceptible to any intake of foreign matter, as demonstrated in the U.S.A. and Canada when drift from nuclear bomb tests fell on pastures, caused cows to store strontium 90 in their milk, even antibiotics can be passed from the cow to her milk. So, we know polluted food or water will be harmful if it doesn't kill her, as happened two years ago when cows wandered from a neighbouring farm onto the present nuclear dump.

Until now we have worked hard with utmost care and hygienic methods to produce clean, whoesome milk to ship to the cities. We are the stringent, sanitary regulations and inspection of the Milk Marketing Board, but feel these will be hard to meet in the future. Would you want your baby or grandchild to be fed a formula made with milk from cows pastured next to the dump site and refinery? Morally we wouldn't either. We sleep better at night knowing there is nothing harmful in the milk we ship to the city dairies.

Besides the hay, grain, corn, and 32 acres of soybean, we sell apples from two orchards on our property. These apples go to local and distant market and some to canning factories. The sideline

crops help to provide the three incomes in this family farm business.

The Mayor of Port Hope which is in the county of Northumberland talks of many jobs for families from his town, here in our region of Durham, so hopes to reap many of the benefits but none of the problems of residue dumped in his back yard. Already many farm workers have been put out of their jobs because of this proposal. In our family farm business four persons work year-round and more are hired during peak harvest seasons; besides the many jobs that farming alone creates in other sectors of society such as machinery companies, city dairies, slaughter houses, feed companies, canneries, civil service inspectors, et cetera. Statistics cite that four out of five jobs are food and farm related.

By approving this Port Granby site for an expanded dump the Hearing Board will abet Port Hope in its "I don't want the dump but-you can have it"attitude to its neighbours here in the Town of Newcastle, so they can reap the benefits of another uranium refinery nearby. Technically we are convinced that the dangers emanating from this refinery far outweigh the social benefits to anyone.

Im not here to refute the literature prepared by Eldorado as I do not have the experitse

to do so. But I do know that when they admit that safety systems are needed in their technology, they are also suggesting a great danger exists. It is my belief that Eldorado even back in the 1950's had the knowledge and scientists on their staff to never have allowed the Town of Port Hope to be in the mess it is in right now from residue that originated at the Eldorado refinery. Even with the supposed watchfulness of AECB, I feel this area will be contaiminated by burying nuclear residue. Since nuclear wastes are forever, we are leaving the coming generations with a very uncertain future here, with this destruction of our environment.

Our two sons plan to carry on our family farm and have been working hard to improve the land by clearing old fence rows, laying drainage tile, improving tillage, et cetera, but now we feel we are just "little guys" and should be sacrificed for a big operation like Eldorado Nuclear Limited who needs a convenient place to store its waste and produce a U.F. 6, which isn't even used here in Canada but all exported elsewehre, if and when they get the permission to do so. While expanding our dairy operation here we never believed we would be confronted with the many problems that an uranium industry will bring. Over the years we chose to

live away from a built-up area with the conveniences of "town", to have a peaceful rural situation. Now with our dairy business established we are to have the inconveniences of speeding traffic, trucks rumbling by, many trains shunting to and fro, and trespassers and urbanites who won't or can't understand the farmers' way of life.

The 630 acres of land for the Eldorado project has been zoned for agriculture and since the government set up Planning Boards to designate land use, we feel industries should go to industrial parks and not be allowed helter-skelter throughout the farming area. The Environmental Action Plan tells us that "the current Ontario Policy is to encourage increased food production on every available acres of its farmland." The Ontario Institute of Agrologists, about 1200, stated:

> "Even if no further improved land were lost to urbanization, it would be difficult for Ontario farmers to produce enough food to satisfy Ontario's population 25 years from now."

Professor Norman Pearson, an agologist, at Western University says "the key to human survival lies in the protection of the essential land base for advanced agriculture. If the

best lands are built on, the urban process is self-destructing." Yet, the 630 acres of land bought by Eldorado has been taken from active farm use.

Other factors we are very concerned about are the increased traffic flow both during and after construction. Even now the heavy trucks carrying wastes to the present Granby dump are causing physical damage to the Town Line Road over which we also haul loads of hay, straw, grain and silage. A severe traffic problem will be caused for our slow-moving vehicles or for a herd of cattle being moved across the busy road. Farming is made very worrisome when gates are left open by trespassers and animals wander out of the fields onto such busy roadways.

We want to keep our land rural, and avoid the hazards of traffic, noise, pollution and contamination a refinery would bring. We feel that we make a contribution to society and are proud to be farmers.

Eldorado says that Port Granby is ideal agricultural land for a refinery and a dump site. We feel that we "little guys" deserve a chance to live and work here too.

Respectively submitted Dora and Clarence Nichols, James and Timm Nichols.

--- Applause

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mrs. Nichols.

MR. SHIKAZE: After that response, I don't know what to say. On behalf of myself and perhaps on behalf of the rest of some of the other Panel members I would like to commend you for an excellent and thoughtful presentation. Would you object or your family object to any other industrial operation in Port Hope or the specified area?

MRS. NICHOLS: Well, we have a strong belief that this is good agricultural land and should not be used for any industry. It isn't zoned industrial.

DR. BIRD: Mrs. Nichols, I would like to take the same type of question and ask you whether you have thought about uranium in some other location. Do you think there is a need for the refinery at all or not?

MRS. NICHOLS: I think there is a need for this refinery, and I know there is a need for us to have exports, but I don't believe we have to export ---

DR. BIRD: That is not quite answering the question.

MRS. NICHOLS: Would you please rephrase it then.

DR. BIRD: I would like to know if the

plan were to put the Eldorado uranium refinery in another location, would you be here voicing your concern about that plan on the basis that we shouldn't be putting in the uranium plant at all?

MRS. NICHOLS: No, I just don't believe it should go in a built-up area of good farm land. I suppose I want it put north somewhere where there is no contamination of the streams. I am as much of an environmentalist as anyone and I don't feel we should be polluting our streams and our lake.

DR. BIRD: So, your concern is with the fundamental location, the location of this second refinery?

MRS. NICHOLS: Well, yes, it affects us, but I don't want to just push it on someone else, no. I don't want to push it on someone else.

DR. BIRD: I thought a moment ago you said it would be all right if it was located in a remote area. It would be all right if it doesn't affect any other people in the neighbourhood, the same as it affects where you are?

MRS. NICHOLS: That's right.

MR. LANG: Mrs. Nichols, I will ask you the same kind of question that I asked of the Mayor of Port Hope a few minutes ago. He apparently

does believe the assurances of the governments that the regulatory process will take care of the impacts and apparently you don't believe that. Would you explain what your basis is of your lack of faith in those processes?

MRS. NICHOLS: Well, over the years that the media has reported a lot of the problems Port Hope has had. We know trucks have lost residue along the highways. Of course they have been cleaned up, but not thoroughly. We know over the years there has been residue dumped along the town line. I just don't have too much faith in Eldorado in their operations so far.

MR. LANG: Okay. The other question is if the refinery were built and I know this is probably speculative on your part, but if the refinery were built, would you see your dairy operation continue?

MRS. NICHOLS: Well, maybe for a few years, but I am not thinking of my generation. For the next generation, no. I can't see it, no.

MR. LANG: Why would that be?

MRS. NICHOLS: Well, the bigger the dump gets, the bigger the residue area around it and the more contamination I believe there will be. As long as it is kept small we might get along for several years, but in the future, the next generation,

I can't really encourage my sons to make it any bigger, because I don't know what shape we will be in.

DR. SCOTT: Am I correct, Mrs. Nichols, in that your real concern is with the dump and the residue rather than the refinery itself? The refinery is land which will take seven acres I think out of the total 650, but the dump takes a considerably larger portion of that. So, it is the dump that you are particularly worried about?

MRS. NICHOLS: Especially with the refinery going in there, we already have the traffic that is going up and down the Town Line. We don't know how the people survive. If there is any more traffic down there and there will be it will make a big change as well. We will have to lock the gates which we shouldn't have to do. As soon as you have got extra people, you have trespassers coming in and leaving the gates open. Just three weeks ago we found an animal on the Town Line and people were having a party and the animals were in a field. The more people you have the more problems you have. So, a refinery would bring in extra traffic.

MR. DUNCAN: Yes. To continue along the same line, what about increased residential areas? How do you feel with regard to residential areas?

MRS. NICHOLS: Well, yes, they have

caused some traffic problems, but our farming has bothered them with the tractors going up that hill. So, that works both ways but, yes, it has made a difference. It has brought more people over there, yes.

MR. DUNCAN: Do you think this would affect your decision on continuing the dairy operation in the same vein as the industry? We are talking about people commuting from Toronto.

MRS. NICHOLS: Well, commuting from Toronto you have to come down, and our farm borders on three or four roads. It is going to affect us one way or another.

MR. DUNCAN: This is a very general concern about the influx of people and the concentration of people.

MRS. NICHOLS: Well, this has been agricultural land and we are running a dairy farm and whether we buy 600 acres back in the northlands, that would be the alternative. We can't see ourselves doing that.

MR. GRANT: Mrs. Nichols, I think you in fact live virtually immediately north of the CPR Railway land, north of the property where it is proposed to build the refinery.

MRS. NICHOLS: That's correct, sir. On

the north half.

MR. GRANT: And it is true, Mrs. Nichols, that between the property and yourself there are two railway lines?

MRS. NICHOLS: No, sir. One of your fields borders right on our land.

MR. GRANT: Pardon?

MRS. NICHOLS: One of your fields borders exactly on our land.

MR. GRANT: No, but doesn't the CPR and the CNR separate your property from my client's property?

MRS. NICHOLS: No, you have ten acres on the north side of the CPR.

MR. GRANT: So, you are just north of the CP?

MRS. NICHOLS: Eldorado owns 10 acres north of the CP and the CN track.

MR. GRANT: I see. You are immediately adjacent to that?

MRS. NICHOLS: Right.

MR. GRANT: But between the place where we propose to put the refinery and the waste disposal or the dump as you call it, there are two CP and CN Lines, am I not correct?

MRS. NICHOLS: Yes, there are.

MR. GRANT: So, what kind of contamination are you worried about with those two lines being there?

MRS. NICHOLS: In the summer, during July, when it was very dry in our area, there was water lying on the ditch both along the north and south areas of both tracks, so the water was coming from somewhere or has been.

MR. GRANT: Do you think the water from the area where they build the refinery could pass the tracks, both of them?

MRS. NICHOLS: I don't know where the underground streams are, but I know the water was there during the dry spell.

MR. GRANT: The other question I have is you mentioned a town line which I gather is a north-south road between the top of Hope and Newcastle; is that correct?

MRS. NICHOLS: Right.

MR. GRANT: Is that road paved?

MRS. NICHOLS: No, sir.

MR. GRANT: Are there a number of residences along the east side of that road?

MRS. NICHOLS: Down by the tracks, yes.

MR. GRANT: Yes. The Eldorado vehicles which proceed southward along that road would be

trucks, would they not?

MRS. NICHOLS: Yes.

MR. GRANT: And have you thought that any Eldorado employees were trespassing on your property or broke your fences?

MRS. NICHOLS: No, I didn't say that, not Eldorado employees.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any further questions from the floor?

CARL ROSE: Did you mention the 650 acres was zoned agricultural? I'm not sure about the situation in this case, but maybe you can clarify it. Most zoning changes, I am led to understand, must be approved by a local Planning Board or an area Planning Board, and then by the Ministry of Housing, and if there are objections that can be looked after in the situation, these are requested by adjacent landowners and given to the OMB for resolution.

Do you know if that is the situation in this case or just the fact that Eldorado is a Federal Crown Corporation, does that lead to a different situation?

MRS. NICHOLS: Well, I can't answer for sure, but I know our council meetings that I did attend back a few months ago were sort of given the

idea that they were a crown corporation and that a crown corporation could overrule Council's decisions.

MR. ROSE: Do you know at the present time if the zoning change has been made yet?

MRS. NICHOLS: No, I don't.

MR. ROSE: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Any further questions?

GRACE HOLDEN: I believe in answer to that last question, I believe we are zoned special study area right now.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. No further questions. I think this would be an appropriate time to take a ten-minute break. I guess there is no coffee, at least in this building, but perhaps there is some down the street. We will reconvene in ten minutes.

--- Short Recess

--- Upon resuming

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, in my opening remarks I forgot one rather important item. It has been requested there be no smoking in the auditorium during the hearings. You will notice we have moved closer to you. I think the bowling has stopped too. Our next speaker is the Port Hope Chamber of Commerce, Mrs. Shirley Eames.

SUBMISSION BY MR. ROSEMARY TISNOVSKY:

Ladies & Gentlemen:

The Port Hope Chamber of Commerce consists of eighty corporate member organizations employing one thousand seven hundred and eight-eight members of our community. It is a trade association affiliated with the Canadian Chamber of Commerce and is comprised of local industries, tourist facilities, retailers, and individuals, who select an administrative board of elected member. The Port Hope Chamber of Commerce does not have a direct interest in the nuclear affairs of Ontario or Canada, but the interest of some of its membership does bear directly on the Canadian Nuclear Program.

Overview of Nuclear Power

The Port Hope Chamber of Commerce firmly believes that Nuclear power has a major role to play in meeting the electrical power needs of many parts of Canada well into the next century at least. The Chamber of Commerce does not believe that nuclear power is the sole answer to Canada's, or any other foreign country's energy needs, however, it is one of those alternative sources of power which may be used until such time as a suitable renewable energy source has been developed. Although Eldorado's planned facilities will be utilized for the refining of uranium products for a major export business, under strict export control, it is also

recognized that the facility will be utilized in maintaining Canada's standard of nuclear expertise. It is also apparent that revenues derived from the facility will be in the form of foreign dollars for services performed on customer-owned Canadian oringin material. It would also be desirable for Eldorado Nuclear Limited to perform custom conversion on foreign origin uramium and which when exported, would yield a net positive balance of trade without depletion of Canada's natural resources.

The reasons for the Port Hope Chamber of Commerce's support of the proposed refinery are: (1) Eldorado Nuclear Ltd. has, since 1932, been a good corporate citizen in Port Hope, with many of their employees having served and are still serving on our town council, fund raising committees for community improvements, service clubs, church groups, etc., assisting in every way possible for the betterment of our community. (2) We believe that this refinery will be a clean and safe operation that will cause the least amount of disturbance to the environment when compared to other sources of electrical power generation. (3) The exonomic impact of recent brown outs and black outs in our hemisphere have already proven the urgent need for additional energy sources. Oil and gas are so

valuable that their mere burning is being increasingly questioned. Since oil and gas account for nearly two-thirds of our total energy consumption and electricity for less than one-third any shift from oil and gas to electricity generated by uranium sources will benefit the conservation of our natural resources. (4) We believe that Environment Canada and other government agencies involved, will adequately police the operations of this refinery to ensure the safety of our community. (5) Community Exonomic Impact: During construction, the payroll for the proposed refinery will be approximately $16,500,000.00 and it has been estimated that over six million dollars will be spent locally.

Construction will employ between 250 - 300 and will benefit, if not directly, at least indirectly, the present high unemployment rate of our community, which at this date is over 10% of the local work force. We realize that the highly technical nature of the workers needed for this refinery's construction and operation may not be available locally at present, but certainly it will encourage our local students in their decision on courses and degrees necessary to induce them to remain in our area for the future.

In conclusion, we would like to thank you ladies and gentlemen and wish you to come to a

favourable and speedy decision so that this project can be completed before inflation makes it impossible. Respectfully submitted, Port Hope Chamber of Commerce, Shirley Eames, President.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mrs. Eames.

MR. DUNCAN: Mrs. Eames, on the first page of your brief you mention that the Port Hope Chamber of Commerce does not have a direct interest in nuclear affairs of Ontario or Canada, but the interest of some of its membership does bear directly on the Canadian Nuclear Program. How does this reflect the views of the Chamber of Commerce?

MRS. EAMES: Well, we have 80 corporate members, one of which is Eldorado Nuclear, and of the 1788 members of our community, they have approximately, I believe, 350 employees.

MR. DUNCAN: Can I ask you how many indirectly are related to it then? You have said directly. I am sorry, that is from the point of view of the people there. I thought there might be another direct one as well in Port Hope, but possibly you would like to clarify that and also a little bit more on the indirect basis if you could. How it would be involved indirectly.

MRS. EAMES: Well, I would as far as the Chamber of Commerce is concerned, I would say there would be only the direct involvement of Eldorado on our membership and their families in our community.

MR. DUNCAN: Is Westinghouse in Port Hope?

MRS. EAMES: I beg your pardon, sir, you are quite correct.

MR. DUNCAN: And out of the other 78, how close would you think that these other members are to the nuclear industry per se, if you know? Is there anybody supplying to Eldorado, supplying to Westinghouse other than your normal community services?

MRS. EAMES: Not to my knowledge, but I wouldn't want to say that there wasn't. I will put it that way.

MR. DUNCAN: So, we are saying two out of the 80 involved?

MRS. EAMES: That's correct.

MR. DUNCAN: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any further questions from the panel?

MR. LANG: When you refer to our community, what do you mean?

MRS. EAMES: I am talking for the

Port Hope Chamber of Commerce which constitutes the business community within a ten-mile area of Port Hope. Anyone in that area is eligible for membership. I don't believe we have anyone further out than three and a half to four miles at the present time.

MR. LANG: And once again, my question sounds like a stuck record, but I would like to get it clear. It seems to me that you were saying that the environmental safety aspect of the refinery operation would be taken care of in the way in which Eldorado conforms to the regulations of the government. Is that correct?

MRS. EAMES: Yes, sir.

MR. LANG: Can you think of anything that could be built on that site that you would not be in favour of that created jobs? Presumably the governments would regulate anything that was built there.

MRS. EAMES: Not at the moment I can't come up with anything. I haven't thought of anything else being put there. I must confess that I think it is unfortunate. It has already been used for Eldorado Nuclear and I personally believe that it is better to keep it all together than have it spread all over the country.

MR. LANG: Altogether. I won't pursue

that. Do you have any concerns about the waste disposal operation that is proposed here?

MRS. EAMES: I haven't gone into the technicalities of that, sir, and I really don't think I should continue on it. I don't personally know anything about it. I must say that I am one of the millions of people that have to put my faith in something and I must put my faith in my government in this case.

MR. LANG: Okay. It seems to me that it is not accidental that you underlined Community Economic Impact. You didn't underline anything else. It seemed to me that that was your main concern.

MRS. EAMES: As a representative of the Chamber of Commerce, I guess I better be interested.

MR. LANG: Yes. Can you see any effects that would not be positive that would come from the refinery on the community itself?

MRS. EAMES: I suppose if I thought long enough about it I could come up with a couple, but at the moment this area desperately needs another industry or enlargement of the industry we have. At this point in time, no I cannot think of anything to answer that question negatively.

MR. LANG: Thanks.

DR. SCOTT: You make an extremely strong statement, or the statement has been made by the Chamber of Commerce on page 3 right at the bottom:

"Oil and gas are so valuable that their mere burning is being increasingly questioned."

Can you give me the source of that statement? Have you any views, particularly yourself? Is there specifically something other than as heating fuels or that type of thing?

MRS. EAMES: I believe the statement was brought up by one of our members as part of the study they had been doing on the oil pipeline that is costing so much money in the far west. I'm sorry, would you like to repeat the last half of the question?

DR. SCOTT: I would like to have your personal opinion as a spokeswoman for the Chamber of Commerce where that lies ---

MRS. EAMES: The value of the oil?

DR. SCOTT: The oil and gas. If they are not for mere burning, what are they for?

MRS. EAMES: Well, ecologically, and I am no expert, sir, but I would think that it takes so much vast area and so many places to get oil and

gas, that it is necessary for even our own Canadian consumption. We bring it in from the far east, from the far west and from the north. I personally believe that we do a lot more damage to our environment through the procurement of oil and gas than we ever will with uranium.

DR. DEROW: I would like to ask you about your last sentence:

"So that this project can be completed before inflation makes it impossible".

Do you fear that? Do you fear that that will happen? Do you have any data that suggests that, indeed, it might stop because of inflation rather than other reasons?

MRS. EAMES: I think it could very well be one reason why it could be stopped, because with the cost of building and everything going up, up, up, and there just seems to be no stopping it.

DR. DEROW: But on what ground would this particular installation be stopped?

MRS. EAMES: I am not saying only this particular instance. We have other things that have been stopped from coming to Port Hope because of inflation and its ugly head is being pointed out to us many times that it is just not feasible.

MRS. DEROW: Does the Chamber of

Commerce do research about such matters?

MRS. EAMES: We try to. Like, we are members of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce and we try to get information from them, but we don't have the sources of research other than our public library, et cetera, at hand.

MR. CHENG: You mentioned that one of the concerns that you have is unemployment and a depressed state of the economy in this general area. I presume you are aware of potential nuclear power projects around this area too that might come in the future. Today, how would you see the present project with respect to the unemployment situation?

MRS. EAMES: Well, I can see it being a very good stopgap until something more feasible, more viable can be brought into the area. This is something that we have actually got, at least to this stage of planning, which is a lot closer than a lot of our daydreams are.

MR. CHENG: Are you aware of the overlap of the project construction and manpower?

MRS. EAMES: Yes, we know what is proposed for the area over the next six months, two years type of thing, and it is not very much other than this and the hydro project. We know for a fact that most of the construction workers that will

be working on it will not be living in the Port Hope area. They will be living in the Bowmanville or Toronto area.

MR. CHENG: So, you feel this project, even though the nuclear project would be going on ---

MRS. EAMES: Well, I personally have not heard of any other nuclear project going on other than this one.

MR. CHENG: Well, I was thinking of things like Darlington.

MRS. EAMES: That is down the road apiece too. I am much more concerned with the immediate problem that we have and this is one of the reasons I say let's get on with it.

MR. CHENG: One further question. I would like to ask you on page 2 you mention that it would be desirable for Eldorado to perform custom conversion on foreign origin uranium and which when exported, would yield a net positive balance of trade without depletion of Canada's natural resources. I just wonder what is your basis of that statement.

MRS. EAMES: I was at a meeting one night when this point was brought up on the floor in a question and answer period and which was discussed. There was a very good chance that foreign countries would ship their uranium here for refining which would

then be shipped back to them under our control and this would give us a very good balance of trade position inasmuch as all we would be selling are services, not our natural resources.

MR. CHENG: Do you have any ideas or information ---

MRS. EAMES: No, I have no ideas what countries or any of the data of it. It was just brought up in a question and answer period.

DR. BIRD: Mrs. Eames, I would like to pursue the line of questioning that Mr. Duncan raised at the beginning of the question period. It has been quite clear that Eldorado is the largest single Industry in Port Hope. In response to his question about other interests or direct interests, you identified Eldorado and, subsequently, Westinghouse.

My question would be that since there are 80 members of your organization, again the same sort of thing I asked the Mayor, to what extent was the statement which you have tabled here seen by all members or bodies of the organization? What input did other members of the Chamber of Commerce were involved and is it fair to say that there was a complete and unanimous agreement that the statement you tabled here reflects the views of all the members?

MRS. EAMES: Well, this Board made known the fact that they would entertain briefs from the various agencies. We brought it up at regular board meetings and a letter was sent out to every one of our members asking them to participate. We received vocal replies and we received some written replies and the input from all of those has gone into this statement.

DR. BIRD: Were there any members who opposed the statement?

MRS. EAMES: No, sir.

DR. BIRD: Thank you very much.

MR. CHENG: I would just like to follow up on Mr. Bird's question with respect to the processing of foreign origin uranium. You cite the economic advantages that this would have in terms of trade balance, but do the Chamber of Commerce have any position with respect to the fact that it does create waste by producing material of foreign origin? We end up with the waste material.

MRS. EAMES: I'm afraid that you are getting me into technical areas that I don't know anything about.

MR. CHENG: You haven't considered that?

MRS. EAMES: No.

MR. CHENG: With respect to the problem in the Port Hope area with regard to radon, what is the Chamber of Commerce's position in this? Have they made any statement or comment on that?

MRS. EAMES: The Chamber of Commerce went on record at the time of the radon gas problem saying that it endorsed the way in which Eldorado handled their section of that problem. It encouraged the government to participate in getting the clean-up done as quickly as possible and we feel that we did as much as we could. There may have been some members at that time who thought it wasn't done quick enough, but I believe that they are reasonably happy now. I haven't heard any complaints from them recently on that score.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions from the floor?

DOUG SAUNDERS: Are you aware of the fact that in 1974 the United States utilities in the United States ordered 37 reactors, and in 1975 they ordered 14, and in 1976 they ordered 3?

THE CHAIRMAN: I have difficulty seeing how that clarifies the Chamber of Commerce's presentation. That point has been raised by a number of other speakers and I mentioned at the start that it will come in debate later.

MR. SAUNDERS: Well, she was talking about the economic effects and how positive that is and I wanted to know if she considered that particular piece of information.

MRS. EAMES: No.

MR. SAUNDERS: No?

MRS. LAWSON: Mrs. Eames, how much has the clean-up of Port Hope cost to date?

MRS. EAMES: I don't know those figures.

MRS. LAWSON: Who is paying for it?

MRS. EAMES: The people of Canada are paying for it.

MRS. LAWSON: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: One more question of clarification.

MR. WARREN LEWIS: I would like to ask a question. You said Port Hope was eager for industry. Do you consider agriculture an industry?

MRS. EAMES: Yes, but Port Hope is a town and there is no agriculture within the town limits of Port Hope.

MR. LEWIS: Would you be happy if Port Granby attracted a cannery or some agriculturally related factory?

MRS. EAMES: I would be very remiss in

saying that I was opposed to any kind of industry coming into the area, sir. I really don't see the point of the question, because as a representative for the Chamber of Commerce, I am also on the local industrial commission.

MR. LEWIS: I merely wanted to make the point that there are alternative industries besides Eldorado. Thank you.

MRS. EAMES: That is quite possible.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes?

MR. QUENTIN BEGGS: I would like to represent the local construction workers. Just to clarify the question about the overlap of construction, if this information is required by the Panel, we would be only too glad to submit the information, the number of unemployed construction workers and the whole bit. It was mentioned the other night about the Darlington Power Project and the overlap. I would say it was two years from then, we were talking at Darlington about a year and a half before any construction begins. That is common knowledge. At the moment we have very high unemployment and I would be only too glad to get all, everything involved in the overlap of construction of these projects.

DR. DEROW: Could we have that

information in written form?

MR. BEGGS: I would say that the local construction exchange, the building trades would submit a brief and at that time we will give you that information.

THE CHAIRMAN: Our next speaker is Rosemary Tisnovsky from Port Granby.

MRS. TISNOVSKY: My name is Rosemary Tisnovsky and I live at Broken Front 6 and it is right next door to the Eldorado property and we have farmed in beef farming and vegetable crops. We seemed to have enjoyed a fairly quiet life.

THE CHAIRMAN: You will have to pull the microphone toward you.

MRS. TISNOVSKY: We just farm ourselves. It is a family operation. We have had land supplies and the children help us, and a company like Eldorado wants to move in and we read about contamination and the land which will be dug out and I can't see why a factory would be allowed to locate on agricultural land when agricultural land will be in demand as long as mankind exists. You will have to give my speaking. My English isn't that good. But, Eldorado, how long will Eldorado be around?

Yet, the Mayor of Port Hope speaks about we need the energy to clear the land. Well, the

land is there and it is cleared and it is producing. Our records will verify that. I feel that we are doing a very good job. We grow Spanish onions, cucumbers, tomatoes and peppers and we like the location by the lake, because the climate is much more suitable and it seems to hold off frost in the spring and the fall where somebody two miles north will have their fields frozen. We can still continue our harvest of tomatoes and peppers and cucumbers.

Gentlemen, I am stuck. I'm sorry. Well, I guess I am not an expert and I really can't say we need a refinery in Canada, here or where we need it, but I can say that certainly the land is here and producing. Why can't Eldorado go somewhere where it is not interfering with anybody. It is just for the convenience of a few people what is in mind because they don't want to move and they have their foot in the door and they want to go all the way in. What guarantee will we have if they will not contaminate the surrounding area?

They are talking about a big smoke stack and they are sending out leaflets saying that it will retard the growth of trees very little, but what effect will that have on tomatoes which are very very sensitive. Even when they spray the road a half a mile down with 24D, we had the leaves killed on our

tomatoe plants just from the smell of it. There was no drift or anything.

I also wanted to say -- I don't know if this is proper or not -- but I especially didn't bring the best Spanish onions so that you can say I brought the pick of the lot. I brought the average Spanish onions. I want to know where else in Canada you can grow onions that size.

---Applause

And the lakeshore is such a scenic area. Mr. Grant, I believe in the very first meeting with the Bowmanville Chamber of Commerce in the Town Hall, indicated that they will probably consider closing the scenic Lakeshore Road because it goes right through the middle of the property and I really feel this is what they possibly have in mind because if they had a bumper zone, they are not going to let a busy public road go through the front door with the subdivision on the other side and to go right out the lakeshore. I always dreamed of passing the farm onto my children and I hope to my grandchildren, but with a factory like Eldorado going in, I don't see how I can possibly encourage my children to farm in these uncertain conditions, because we don't know to what extent in the future Eldorado will pollute this area.

I don't even subscribe to a newspaper.

We are living very quietly doing our own business and all of a sudden all this confusion about Eldorado and the refinery and industry and lawyers knocking on your doors and real estate agents knocking on your doors and I just feel I want everyone to go away. Just leave us in peace and do our farming and do what we know best. Let us farm and send Eldorado some place where they can do their thing if they have to do it. I don't know. I am not really that familiar with it. I just know what I feel, that is good land, producing well and can serve Canada a great deal, because the food industry will be around a very, very long time, and I can't see really that Eldorado is going to be around that long. Thank you very much.

--- Applause

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your very graphic presentation. Any questions from the Panel?

MR. SHIKAZE: I only have one. Are the onions for sale?

MRS. TISNOVSKY: They are all gone.

MR. LANG: I missed the beginning of your presentation. Where is it that you live and farm in relation to the south?

MRS. TISNOVSKY: Right next door. They own Lots 1 and 2 and 4 and 5 and we are on Lot 6.

Their fence is right across from our property. We are right next door. Actually, we share a fence with Eldorado.

Can I make one more point, please? That is another thing. They tried to rent the land as much as they can, but they couldn't rent it and they let the ditches go with the highest weeds you can imagine and when they were well into seed and well advanced, and just before the meetings they hired someone to cut down all those weeds. A lot of damage was done to a lot of the areas because the strong winds will take them all over.

MR. CHENG: Well, just a short question. I am trying to determine when did you hear about the project? You said you didn't subscribe to a newspaper.

MRS. TISNOVSKY: The only one I subscribe to is one that is free and that is the Newcastle Reporter. So, I get it through neighbours. Actually I was always aware there was a dump up there, but I didn't really know what kind of dump it was until two years ago when Bud Elder lost six cows on that property. Then, you kind of stop and think, what on earth is it in there that kills cows?

Also, the property that Eldorado owns now is highly productive as far as vegetables. I have

seen huge crops of tomatoes taken off.

MR. CHENG: When did you hear about the new refinery?

MRS. TISNOVSKY: I believe -- I don't know. There was something in the paper that the lawyer of Eldorado was going to meet with the Council in Bowmanville. I guess one of the neighbours phoned me and we decided to go up and see what they had to say.

MR. CHENG: And that was six months ago?

MRS. TISNOVSKY: No, it was longer ago than that. I guess it must have been about a year ago now. Does that sound about right? I think it was last fall or late in the fall anyway.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Derow.

DR. DEROW: You mentioned that you like to live in peace, undisturbed, but you mentioned several people were knocking on your door, lawyers and real estate people. Why, I wonder why they would knock on your door and when they knocked on your door?

MRS. TISNOVSKY: Apparently we have a low spot from Eldorado coming, a swamp-like, a small creek most of the time, but in the spring water will run and come directly from Eldorado coming down to our water supply, our creek where the cows would drink

from and I guess they just felt that in the future Eldorado would have to buy it. Now, this is just what I feel, but they would want to buy that land in order to control every land which is lying below them or something like that. Do you understand?

DR. DEROW: No, I don't understand. Eldorado's lawyer knocked on your door to tell you this?

MRS. TISNOVSKY: We were misled in the beginning into believing it was Eldorado. The gentleman who knocked on my door, and he actually claimed, and I can pretty well quote him, he offered a pretty good price I might add, but he said we could either sell out at that price, which he said was very good, or we could wait until we got expropriated, or we could wait until our cows dropped dead. Those were his exact words. I think if he hadn't used such strong terms, I wouldn't have called a lawyer in to see if Eldorado could get away with it. Through different sources we found out that Eldorado had nothing to do with that.

DR. DEROW: Thank you, very much.

DR. BIRD: Mrs. Tisnovsky, I wonder if you could state your position with respect to any development of that land. You have been very familiar with respect to the importance of maintaining

the lands and the agricultural production. Supposing another kind of industry were being proposed. Would you have the same feelings about it?

MRS. TISNOVSKY: I don't think I would like to see it cemented over for any reason.

MR. GRANT: Mrs. Tisnovsky, you mentioned that you recall being at the meeting at which I indicated on behalf of Eldorado that it was Eldorado's intention, I think you said, to close Lakeshore Road. While you may have thought I said that, I don't think there was any intention on the part of Eldorado to close Lakeshore Road, nor is there any intention now.

MRS. TISNOVSKY: I am afraid you did mention that and, I don't know if there were people here at that meeting with me, but I clearly remember you said that in time they might consider closing the Lakeshore Road. I don't know if someone keeps a record of those meetings, but it was the first meeting you had and there were two more lawyers with you and it was in the Town Hall in Bowmanville.

MR. GRANT: Well, if you had that understanding, you are wrong. There is no plan of Lakeshore Road ever being closed. Now, you did indicate --- Did you say it was a lawyer that knocked on your door with respect to the acquisition

of your property?

MRS. TISNOVSKY: I never checked the man out, but his name was Chimpager and he brought a purchase and sale paper, an offer which at the time we felt -- my husband comes from a communist country and he always feels that if the government wants something they usually get it. We figured that we were better off not complaining. So, we were thinking that maybe it would be better if we signed. It was a generous offer and if the man had not been so pushy, we probably would have signed the land over to Eldorado. We thought it was Eldorado, like I said, but it wasn't.

MR. GRANT: You mentioned that you don't normally read newspapers. Did you know that Eldorado made an announcement after that incident denying any liability or responsibility? Did you hear that on the radio?

MRS. TISNOVSKY: No, I did not, but I was very upset because I didn't really, I didn't want anybody to know about it, because I felt we made fools of and I phoned Mr. Veldhuis and I was going to ask him if he would just not put it in the newspaper. But before I mentioned it to him, he told me that Eldorado had released the statement to that effect, and I phoned Eldorado Limited and Mr. Colbourne

read it to me, the statement that Eldorado made to the newspaper, over the telephone.

MR. POCH: I am somewhat confused. If I read the document, the EIS correctly, there is a diagram in there that clearly shows that the Lakeshore traffic is going to be re-routed around the northern portion along the railroad tracks. Is that map incorrect?

MR. GRANT: Which map?

MR. POCH: I haven't got a copy here. There is a copy, not the little sketch, it is the big one, the EIS. It is a pattern, a map in there showing the traffic pattern. That I think is what Mrs. Tisnovsky is talking about.

MR. GRANT: That is beyond our control. It is a matter of jurisdiction of the municipality, the location of all roads. We have not made a determination as to what route we would follow to get into the property, but as far as I am aware, we certainly have made no public statement, because we have not made a decision in this regard... We have made no public statement and show on no maps, that I am aware of, the closing of the Lakeshore Road. It would be presumptious of us to do so.

MR. POCH: I think some of your people are looking up that information. You are quite

correct as far as I understand that no such statement has been made that the road is going to be closed, but no such statement has been made that it will be kept open.

MR. GRANT: We haven't said we will keep the 401 open either.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think Eldorado might perhaps clarify that this evening or tomorrow. I have some recollection that they considered the possibility of re-routing the Lakeshore Road. I don't know whether it was 200 yards further north or something like this. Perhaps when you find it, you can help clarify this. Are there any other questions of Mrs. Tisnovsky? Thank you, ma'am.

Our next speaker is Mrs. D. Boisvert.

A CITIZEN: Mr. Chairman, she is away on family business. I don't know if she is back yet.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you expect her this evening?

A CITIZEN: She was supposed to be back tonight.

THE CHAIRMAN: Maybe you could ask her to contact our secretary and we could probably re-schedule it.

We pass on to Mr. Robert Dykstra.

MR. DYKSTRA: Mr. Chairman, before I

start, I don't have sufficient copies of my brief. Would it be possible that I leave one of my presentations at each table so you can share them?

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you intend to read from it?

MR. DYKSTRA: Yes. Mr. Chairman, Members of the Panel, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I think you for the opportunity, to enable me as a citizen, to express to you my concerns. I would like to point out to you that because I am a member of the Newcastle council, the concerns that I am about to present to you are personal and therefore not necessarily endorsed by Council as such.

In the past six months I have tried to come to grips and wrestled with the problems that may be associated with an uranium refinery, In this case at Port Granby, that causes our immediate concern.

I have been reading and checking the almost overwhelming flood of information, papers and environmental studies, and have done some work on site inspection of the present waste disposal at Port Granby and have taken a tour through Eldorado's present operation in Port Hope. After all of this I became very much aware of the tremendous

responsibilities, "YES ELDORADO OR NO ELDORADO"???

Mr. Chairman and members, I would like you to realize as I went through this research, that time and time again I became reminded of the song that my children love to sing, and is very dear to them: the title of this song is very striking, "This is my Father's World". You know, Mr. Chairman, panel members, ladies and gentlemen, that is the very key to all of this, we all have been entrusted with a tremendous responsibility, that rests upon our shoulders.

When we work and live in this country and see it's rolling hills, the fields and their crops, the trees, its seasons, the lakes; and gaze into the sky, we stand in awesome wonder and we realize what a beautiful creation this is. I hope as panel members you realize the tremendous responsibilities that have been entrusted to you, you have been chosen to examine the environmental consequences and its impacts of Eldorado's proposal. You are called a small body of experts in the letter sent by "Environment of Canada to all the residents.

And that puts upon your shoulders a very responsible task: we are going through a process of what is known as a Democratic Procedure, we the people are given the opportunity to voice our

concerns. I would sincerely hope that this does not become "and arena of abuse", where millions and millions of dollars speak louder than the concern of our people, the citizens of Canada.

In the letter addressed to all our residents it makes mention of a second set of hearings to involve in-depth examination of the issues identified, it goes on to say that the exact timing depends largely on the deficiencies identified (and then come two very small "key words", they are small in size but they have a tremendous impact) if any.

And, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Panel, I submit to you, those two words "if any" should be changed to read: "if many", because there are many concerns.

Because we live in a country that has been blessed with many natural resources, be they gas, oil, coal, gold or silver, et cetera, or in this case uranium. That does not give us the right to use these sources irresponsibly, we may accept the challenge to do great things, but not at the cost of our children's future.

We may rise to the challenge only when we are sure that it is to the betterment of us all; not just our pocket book or bank account. But

a wise use of our natural resources has been entrusted to us, and again that word wise is very important.

I would like to bring a number of specific questions to the attention of the Panel along with a series of comments, for your deliberations.

1. Why should this refinery be located in Port Granby: when all produced product is used for export, and we are left behind with the waste problem.

2. Out of 17 sites across the Province some are fair, some are good, but only one appears to be very good. I can't believe this statement.

3. What about the past record of Eldorado?

a) Radium contaminated fill in Port Hope.

b) Port Granby Dump: problems and lack of control.

4. Does the public get a fair participation when it does not have the tremendous financial resources, that are available to the Crown Corporation such as Eldorado?

5. How come Eldorado was able to

get away with "sloppy management" on waste disposal in the past under the watchful eye of the Atomic Energy Control Board of Canada?

6. Was this watchful eye not strong enough in the past, or was it more concerned with dollars for Canada's economy rather than its environment?

7. How can we as citizens be assured that we, and most of all our children, will be protected against the danger of radioactive contamination? It is obvious from experience that the past measures have not been adequate.

I make the following comments for your deliberations:

I am not satisfied that all precautionary measures and waste management are adequate.

I am not satisfied that the location is very good, compared to 16 others.

I am not satisfied that this refinery necessarily has to be located in Canada when all products produced are exported. If they need it maybe they should be subjected to the potential danger of waste material.

I am not satisfied that the Atomic Energy Control Board of Canada should control this

because of past record.

Mr. Chairman, and members of the panel, in all sincerity what I am trying to say is I cannot say yes to an 80 million dollar investment in our community irregardless if the payroll may be $3,000,000 and taxes 1/2 million or more. Until I have been completely satisfied that it is safe for our own people and our children, at the present time I can dream of a beautiful factory plus all the payroll benefits as mentioned above.

But as a citizen of this beautiful country, Canada, it is my God-given duty to participate and ensure that we do not ruin it because of worldly greed.

I urge you all to make sure that whatever the outcome, you have assured yourself that it is to the betterment of us all not just money-wise. It can be replaced. But even $80 million cannot buy back one life if it be endangered because of poor or hasty planning.

In conclusion, may I say I am gravely concerned. I ask you to take into consideration in your decision making progress, the will of our heavenly Father, the creator of heaven and earth. I hope that: "God grant you the serenity to accept

the things you cannot change, the courage to change the things you can and thewisdom to know the difference."

And Mr. Chairman and member of the Panel, remember: "This is my Father's World".

--- Applause

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Dykstra for a very succinct presentation. Are there any questions from the Panel?

DR. DEROW: On page 4 you refer to "sloppy management". Could you elaborate and clarify what you mean by sloppy management on the waste disposal?

MR. DYKSTRA: Could you repeat the question so I can hear?

DR. DEROW: On page 4 at the top you ask how it was that Eldorado was able to get away with "sloppy management" on waste disposal in the past under the watchful eye of the Atomic Energy Control Board of Canada.

MR. DYKSTRA: What page?

DR. DEROW: Page 4, point number 5. I was wondering if you would elaborate on this and define what sloppy management in quotation marks is.

MR. DYKSTRA: I am quite willing to

elaborate on that statement. It is a statement, as I have indicated, that is personal, but I think it is very well known and should be very well known around this area that Eldorado was granted the extension of six months as has earlier been indicated, but were only granted that because they had to fulfill a tremendous amount of work in respect to the filtration of the present dump site when they discovered that certain aspects of waste were leaking into Lake Ontario, that were certainly not desirable. Because of that, Eldorado have had to spend thousands and thousands of dollars to put a filtration system in with lagoons to dam the two streams or valleys that come out of the present Eldorado site and to pump that water back up into the lagoons and put it through a treatment system and control this dump in this manner.

I submit to you that I feel that much of this dumping that has taken place before this was found out, that that was leaking into Lake Ontario and was not properly managed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any further questions from the Panel?

DR. BIRD: Mr. Dykstra, you have commented on the fact that you can't believe the statement that the site selected is the only one that

is very good. I take it then that you have examined the report which attempted to compare the different sites. I wonder if you could give us some of your views as to which of the other sites might be, in fact, as suitable or more suitable.

MR. DYKSTRA: I will try to answer your question. First of all, I have to relate the panel to this particular document. This is the Port Granby plan. That particular statement is in this document. It is a public document dealing with Port Granby and you will find that statement right in there. I think that, and I may stand corrected on this one, but I do feel that what is stated in here should be substantiated and I have been unable to find that substantiating material anywhere. That is number one why I made the statement in here.

Number two, I think this is the only area out of the 17 areas that has had the extensive environmental studies and potentials that might happen to the area and the surrounding area out of all the 17 sites that are mentioned.

DR. BIRD: You have apparently visited the information centre and toured the plant. Have you seen the three volumes of the Environmental Impact Statement that have been prepared on behalf of Eldorado by the consultants?

MR. DYKSTRA: Yes.

DR. BIRD: Have you had a chance to look through those and see, in fact, that there is a fair amount of information about the sites and that they have progressively reduced the number? There was a procedure where they eliminated one after the other and finally a decision was arrived at by Eldorado to select the Port Granby site. I find it difficult to understand, because there is a fair amount of background information about a large number of these sites.

MR. DYKSTRA: Well, there is a substantial amount of information, sir, but I submit to you that I wonder if that information would be similar, if those sites had experienced the same extensive scrutiny as Port Granby did in respect of what may happen to the dump.

MR. SHIKAZE: You mentioned that you toured the existing Eldorado operation. What were your impressions?

MR. DYKSTRA: I have toured the existing Eldorado operation and my impression was that I toured a very clean and neat operation.

MR. SHIKAZE: The other question I have related to your position as a councillor on the Newcastle Council, I believe it is. Would the Council

or would you as a representative on the Council object to any other development that took place in that general area?

MR. DYKSTRA: It would depend a great deal on what type of development we are talking about and what potential hazards may be associated with it. Let me bring one thing to your attention, that although I may indicate that at the moment I am completely opposed to this development, and I am because I am not convinced that we are in need of this waste material in Canada, if somebody can prove to me in positive terms that this particular industry can perform in an adequate measure, and can assure the safety of it all, I can stand corrected. At the moment I cannot support this industry.

DR. DEROW: You have done a great deal of research and reading of the Environmental Impact Assessment and taking the tour. You also say you did some work on site inspection of the present waste disposal facility. Could you clarify that?

MR. DYKSTRA: I took a number of council members. We took the time to make ourselves aware of the present dump site. We were quite upset at the short notification the public received from the Atomic Energy Control Board of Canada in respect to the renewal of the dump for a period of six months

at the start of the year. I think we got something like a week or a week and a half notice. I could stand corrected by half a week one way or the other. This caused some grave concerns in our Council and elected officials and we took the time to tour the site and we took the time to tour the site while the last lagoons were being constructed. The benzonite clay was being mixed into the soil. We walked the entire dump site with representatives of Eldorado and we went through it and we saw the measures being taken to prevent further problems of pollution. I do say that they are doing their utmost to comply with the regulations laid down by the Atomic Energy Control Board of Canada.

DR. DEROW: Well, in January there was some controversy in continuing the licence and it was continued for six months. Then after six months. Then after six months it was renewed again and there was no controversy.

MR. DYKSTRA: There was a letter received by Council and there was concern expressed as far as I can remember, but I can't recall the renewal that was given at that time, to be honest with you.

DR. DEROW: You don't know how long?

MR. DYKSTRA: It is not in my head.

I should have marked it down, because I do have a record of it. I know how it went.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Cheng?

MR. CHENG: Can you clarify some small confusion in my mind with respect to this licencing for six months business? We have just heard the Mayor of Port Hope who said that the Council of Port Hope supported the licencing and I presume the Council of the Town of Newcastle is expected to do the same sort of thing. Support or no support -- what is the effect on the whole business? Does AECB take that into consideration or what?

MR. DYKSTRA: Well, at the time the application was made, I was the first one I think of the members of Council to find out about this that there was an extension being asked by Eldorado through the Atomic Energy Control Board of Canada for an extension, and I was made aware of that, not in our local Council Chamber, but I was made aware of this in the regional planning and development committee meeting of which I am a member, because of the office I hold as regional council. I was very concerned at that moment that we had not received any notification at the local level and to hear somebody make mention of the fact that an extension was being granted to Eldorado for six months dumping at Port Granby. I then

took the effort immediately to step outside of the room and got the secretary to phone the clerk at Newcastle or at Bowmanville to check to find out if we had any information at the local level that did not come before the local council and we did not. I then had the secretary phone Mr. Colbourne at Port Granby and he indicated that there was an extension asked, but they had no reply back from the Atomic Energy Board of Canada.

MR. CHENG: Supposing Council does not support such an action? Does that have any effect at all anywhere with respect to this?

MR. DYKSTRA: Supposing that Council does not ---

MR. CHENG: Does not support it. I understand the Council of Port Hope supported the extension of the licence for six months. Supposing the Town of Newcastle does not support such a licence extension. What does that really mean in terms of granting the licence?

MR. DYKSTRA: I am not exactly sure what the Atomic Energy Control Board of Canada would do, sir. I can't tell you. If we as council in the municipality of Newcastle decided to oppose this dumping or any future dumping to take place at the present Port Granby site, I don't know if that would

be of any effect on the ruling of the Atomic Energy Control Board of Canada or not. I have no idea. I can't answer for the Atomic Energy Control Board of Canada.

MR. CHENG: I just wanted to know your impression, that was all.

MR. DYKSTRA: You know what I mean. Am I giving your answer?

MR. CHENG: Yes.

MR. DYKSTRA: The other thing that I wish to point out to you is that it was only after we were thoroughly made aware of all the aspects of what Eldorado had to do in respect of lagoons and the dams and all this type of stuff when the six month's extension was granted, that could be still to indicate that okay, to some extent, we were a bit assured to the fact that measures were being taken. So, on that basis, I think you will find this is why council felt that it could be extended for a further period of a year or whatever it was when it came up not too long ago. I am not too sure on the dates of this. As I told you, I did not bring that information along. I questioned the aspects of the entire thing and that is why I told you I am here personally.

MR. POCH: Mr. Poch, representing the

Town of Newcastle. I would like to reiterate what Mr. Dykstra said. He is here in person and the town has not come at this time to support the proponents application or not and that will be forthcoming, if not at this phase of the hearing at a subsequent phase.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I believe you mentioned that last week in Bowmanville also. We have a few more questions from the panel and then we will go to the audience.

MR. LANG: Perhaps you could respond to this question. It really follows on Mr. Cheng's question. Your council's position on this in terms of jurisdiction is gratuitous, isn't it? You don't have any jurisdiction over this matter. It is between Eldorado and the Atomic Energy Control Board, even though I can understand the council is concerned in expressing that point of view.

MR. POCH: Well, in strict legal terms my understanding at this time is that we don't. I stand to be corrected by further research. The proponents have stated that they hope to and intend to comply in the spirit of the law if not by the law. We have concern since there are provincial and municipal legislations that do affect the town directly.

MR. LANG: Are you going to be making a presentation that is going to be put forward in a few days?

MR. POCH: Mr. Willms will be presenting the brief.

MR. LANG: Could you for my benefit make it clear at that time where you see your jurisdiction lying, and I mean specifically. We could have this ping-pong game back and forth about where exactly Eldorado is prepared to comply with the spirit of the law and so on. I'm thinking specifically of powers you do exercise which they will have to comply with, for example, service connections and that kind of thing. It would help a lot if you could spell that out in your brief.

MR. POCH: We have endeavoured to set forth our jurisdiction in our brief. We do have questions of Eldorado relating to jurisdiction ourselves and these will be forthcoming and hopefully we will clarify it. If not at stage one, then in stage two under cross-examination.

DR. DEROW: Is it the regional planning board or what board?

MR. DYKSTRA: The Planning and Development Committee that I sit on.

DR. DEROW: Does this include the

regional municipality of Durham?

MR. DYKSTRA: Yes. We are in the Regional Municipality of Durham.

DR. DEROW: May I ask a few questions about special study number 12 and what it means?

MR. DYKSTRA: Yes, and if I can answer them, what would you like to know?

DR. DEROW: I tried to read the plan and it indicated that special studies would be carried out there.

MR. DYKSTRA: You must first of all understand that the regional Official Plan is a document that is not a legal document at this stage. It is the proposed regional Official Plan for the Region of Durham. It has not been endorsed.

DR. DEROW: But, in proposing a special study area, I was wondering what was in the minds of those who proposed it? What sort of studies?

MR. DYKSTRA: The special study area came into the regional Official Plan prior to me coming into the political arena this last year. I have been in it before when it was not in the regional structure, but the interpretation of special study areas of which there are numbers in the Regional Official Plan, this would be called special area number 12, which I recall off the top of my head.

The areas are created because they know that there is either a potential facility going to be built in this particular case, or there is potential environmental dangers as there was in this particular case. They know the area has to be subjected to further study before it can be zoned. Nobody would go ahead and zone that particular piece of land as industrial without further study. I think the study includes the region and it consists of elected officials who have been satisfied that those studies have been performed to the satisfaction of all the regional councils, all of the region of Durham and when they are finished, they either say yes or no.

DR. DEROW: The special studies, would you include the Environmental Assessment Impact Statement as a special study in this area in proposing further study? Who was it that was supposed to be responsible for carrying out the special studies?

MR. DYKSTRA: The region would be doing them.

DR. DEROW: The region?

MR. DYKSTRA: They will do a certain amount of study. This is only a proposed plan. I think the timing is critical because decisions may be made before these are ever off the ground. I think you

have before you a written submission from the Region of Durham. It was submitted to you.

DR. DEROW: But I am interested in the special studies. Thank you.

A CITIZEN: I was a member of the Newcastle Council when this was sent to the region for special study. I don't want to contradict Mr. Dykstra and I don't mean to. He is more up to date, but you asked why and what. I understood the special study at that particular time, maybe 15 months ago, it meant, this is an area we don't know what to do with. That is why we have a special study and it was a very, very serious problem and it was really a question of share the wealth or passing the buck. I felt at that time that the region had a lot more staff, a lot more resources in staff and would advise and help the town to resolve the problem of the Eldorado study.

THE CHAIRMAN: This was a special study because there already was a dump existing there, and that meant that further study was needed before you could do anything.

A CITIZEN: Not particularly, sir. I seem to remember there was a proposal in before Eldorado were talking about building a new plant. There was a proposal for a mobile home park in that

area. I am sure that all the people here knew about that. It was before the Newcastle Council. Then suddenly lands were changing hands and Eldorado were coming forward and we expected a proposal for a plant which literally was beyond the capability of the Newcastle resources and the regional government was, I believe, was here to help us staff-wise, but the expression special study, during the planning of the regional plan, during the putting together of it in Oshawa, for instance, that was a special study, for an example. It was an area they couldn't resolve before they completed the planning. It was called a special study, but that is why it was done, to sort of freeze it.

DR. DEROW: It has never been resolved, though?

MR. DYKSTRA: I wasn't there then.

MR. EADES: I would like to congratulate you on the excellent discourse you made. I have just one question for you and if you can't answer it -- the whole panel has been questioning you. You put it out to them. The question is, do you know of any other places where they are dumping uranium hexachloride as close to Lake Ontario as they are at Port Granby? Do you know of any other place on the shore of Lake Ontario? Thank you.

MR. GRANT: We aren't dumping uranium hexachloride at that site. Perhaps you made a mistake in your question.

MR. EADES: Whatever you are dumping, do you know of any other places on the lakeshore of Lake Ontario that they are dumping -- well, it comes from uranium hexachloride.

MR. GRANT: What are you worried about?

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't think we need a three-way conversation. I think you have made your point.

MR. EADES: Can you answer the question, anyone?

MR. DYKSTRA: The question is directed to myself and, through you, may I attempt to answer the question. In this respect that I personally am not aware of this type of material being dumped anywhere close to a body of water like Lake Ontario, that is my personal opinion, I am not aware of it, and I don't know if the panel is aware of it, but I am not sure ---

THE CHAIRMAN: I suggest it is a good question for the second phase when we discuss the waste management area.

DR. BIRD: I have just one question that I would like to ask Mr. Dykstra. There have been

a fair number of questions asked here and I just want to confirm in my own mind what I believe is my consensus of the major concern that you have, because what you have said in terms of some of the answers you have given, I have concluded that the main concern you have about the new plant proposal is the problem related to the waste disposal, both the present site and any disposal from the new plant. Is that fair?

MR. DYKSTRA: You have a fair assumption of that, yes. That is correct, sir. I think that the members of the Panel too I am sure must be aware that this type of refinery, the major problem with it is the waste disposal.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any further questions?

MR. GRANT: Mr. Dykstra, if you were satisfied or this panel were satisfied that the manner in which my client proposes or will deal with the waste from its refinery operation will cause no harmful impact on the environment or people in the neighbourhood, would you be in favour of the construction of a refinery in this location?

MR. DYKSTRA: If I can be totally satisfied that no damage is going to be done to the environment for the people living in the area and no ultimate damage in the future, then I might take a

different position than what I am taking this evening.

MR. GRANT: The other thing that you said in your paper is that you are concerned that the refinery will be located in Canada when the products produced there are exported. I don't know whether you were here during the earlier series when it was indicated that a good deal of uranium in fact originates in Canada. Do I understand you to mean that you would rather export it from Canada in an unrefined form?

MR. DYKSTRA: This is exactly what I am telling you, sir, in this particular statement, that could it not be shipped as a raw material rather than in a refined form? It is commented on in this particular document here. It is a policy of Canada.

MR. GRANT: Would you prefer to see it exported in an unrefined form to some other country where the benefit of that refinement would be enjoyed by that country?

MR. DYKSTRA: I would say, yes, unless you can find another way of disposing the waste.

MR. GRANT: I have something in the way of an explanation of something that has come up a

couple of times on the question of licencing. If I could take a couple of minutes and perhaps clarify the mystery on that score, subject to your approval.

The existing residue area is a licenced facility within the Atomic Energy Control Act. The rules of the Act require that so long as a residue site is located there, that the manner in which that site is operated has to be licenced. Licences are normally given for a definite period of time and subject to periodic review. To bring you up to the present history, some time in the fall of 1976 Eldorado applied for an extension of its licence which was to expire in January of 1977 and provided the Atomic Energy Control Board with certain information. As a result of that explanation or application, the Board extended the licence to Eldorado upon certain terms and conditions. The licence was extended to January 31st, 1977 and most of those conditions or those conditions that could be satisfied within that period of six months, were satisfied to the satisfaction of the Board, as a result of which, upon a further application by Eldorado made between January of 1977 and July of 1977, the Board extended again the licence for a further six-month period, which now expires on January 31st, 1978.

Now, in fact after the review of the

licence in January 1977, and I wasn't certain whether Mr. Dykstra was referring to this problem, this renewal or a later renewal, after that renewal in 1977, that did come to the surprise of local citizens. Eldorado, through myself, advised in writing the Town of Newcastle that Eldorado would be applying for an extension of this licence and that, in fact, it would probably be applying almost in perpetuity for continuing extensions of that licence. It would have to do so so long as there was located on the property any radioactive material which fell within the purview of the Atomic Energy Control Board. I hope that clarifies some of the questions.

DR. DEROW: I would like to ask you what other information was given to the town about the standards. Were the standards secret or open?

MR. GRANT: The conditions on the licence?

DR. DEROW: Yes.

MR. GRANT: No, the Atomic Energy Control Board published a fairly extensive information statement and the town had direct communication with the Atomic Energy Control Board as did other members of the community. There was no secret about that. It was well discussed.

DR. BIRD: I would like to pursue that

a little further, Mr. Grant, and just ask whether there are some new conditions in the extension of the licence that were modifications of those that were imposed or identified in January last year and since we are now into October, and you have said that there will be a need, and I think I understand why, to continue to apply for a further extension, do you see this just being the same set of conditions as applied when the second extension comes in in January of next year, or what is the situation in the future?

MR. GRANT: If you look at the history of the conditions going back to the conditions which expired in January 1977, you will find that the Atomic Energy Control Board began to set forth recommendations for a program of a series of conditions requiring Eldorado to do some rather major things with respect to the property there. For example, the construction and development of the water maintenance facilities in this municipality. Mr. Dykstra was somewhat skeptical about it, but in fact, it is there and we had to provide to the board evidence that we were proceeding in accordance with the normal program of implementing certain recommendations and that is a particularly good example, the water treatment facility. I don't naturally have in my head all the present conditions which are contained

in the existing licence, but I do know that it is necessary for Eldorado to provide to the Board frequent, maybe monthly or bi-monthly, reports on the contaminants contained in the water emanating from the site. I know that the Board has made it a condition of the present licence, which I think may have been referred to in the preview. I think it was in the licence to require Eldorado to think of ways and means of decommissioning the site, possibly removing the property completely or dealing with it on a permanent basis and we are not anxious to rush in to something if it is not long term.

DR. BIRD: Is it fair to assume that you wouldn't have introduced the new water treatment process unless the Atomic Energy Control Board made it a condition of extension of licence? Would you agree that if we, as member of the panel, that if at the end of the six-month period ---

MR. GRANT: We could provide you with a copy of the licence which contained the conditions and any other information made available. The first question is the loaded question. In a sense, the Board is our boss and if they say jump, we say how high. We may not have thought that the problems existing, if it did exist in the effluents from the streams was as serious as the Board thought it was,

but the Board did think it was serious and we, in fact, volunteered to do this. Our present information, frankly, is that it was almost a waste of money.

DR. BIRD: Why do you say that?

MR. GRANT: Well, the quantities of contaminants that are being dealt with in this very, very costly water treatment facility are so minimal, according to our information, when you measure them any reasonable distance from the shore line, it is difficult to justify on an economic basis, and also on an environmental basis, the cost of the construction of that water treatment facility. But those conditions were given to us and we thought it would be good to have it in case things change in the future.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Dykstra.

MR. DYKSTRA: May I be permitted, through you, to ask one further question to Mr. Grant. Will you allow this or not?

THE CHAIRMAN: Sure.

MR. DYKSTRA: The items raised in respect to the zoning of the land in previous delegations that spoke, they asked about what is the land zoned. The land is in a special study area. The regional proposed the official plan, but it is still in an agricultural zone as such and I would like

to ask, because I am not familiar with it -- I have done a tremendous amount of reading to find out this, but does a crown corporation have to go through the same procedure that an industry that does not belong to the Crown goes through, or do they automatically get exemptions from that procedure of going through the application of asking for a change of zoning from agricultural to let's say, in this case, industrial?

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Grant?

MR. GRANT: I think we have dealt with this question before, but the answer correctly is that in our view, in my view as a lawyer, Eldorado and the Crown does not have to -- and I emphasize the word "have", in that it is not legally obligated to do so, to comply with those local municipal requirements. However, Eldorado is not the only Crown Corporation, Federal Crown Corporation which has for many, many reasons elected in the past and will probably continue to elect to comply with those laws and by-laws and regulations which would normally be applicable to it if it were not a Crown Corporation. It is not for me to provide a dissertation on the constitutional reasons for it, but I think that is the answer to your question.

MR. DYKSTRA: One other point of

information for the members of the panel, Mr. Chairman, with your permission is the point I think that I may stand corrected on, and Mr. Grant could correct me if he wishes, but it was indicated to us by the members of the Atomic Energy Control Board of Canada when they appeared, I think either in the latter part of January or early part of January, somewhere in the beginning of the year before our council that they indicated that it is not a normal policy for the Atomic Energy Control Board of Canada to inform the elected officials of an extension or an application for an extension to a dump such as that. That is not part of the policy.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Dykstra. We can perhaps pursue that further with them. Do we have a question of clarification? We have gone almost an hour ---

MR. DOUG SANDERS: When the AECB sets up conditions under which you should operate a waste disposal site, those conditions are expected to be met. What I would like to know, as I understand it, the water treatment for the two rivers or creeks that run through the waste dump, the treated pumphouse which is an integral part of that has never operated and yet the conditions under which you were allowed to continue were that you have some sort of

water treatment process. Can you clarify that for me?

MR. GRANT: If I understand your question -- if your question is why wasn't the water treatment facility including the pump functioning during the whole period the property was licenced -- is that your question?

MR. SANDERS: Yes, I understand that was the condition.

MR. GRANT: Because it wasn't until 1976, late 1976 that the Atomic Energy Control Board directed effectively that we find a solution to what it thought was a problem. We thought the solution was that we build a water treatment facility. So, they have only been there recently.

MR. SANDERS: Well, recently, after AECB added that condition to your operation of the plant, since that time, as I understand it, the pumphouse has never worked. The pumphouse has not been working. Is that true or false? I would like to clarify that.

MR. GRANT: Well, I am not a technical person, but Gord Colbourne says that it has not been pumping because the water has been running uphill all the time. I don't know how that happened. It only works if the pump works.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think I have to agree with Mr. Grant. There are many other ways it can get up there. Are there any other questions?

MR. POCH: This is a point of clarification of an earlier question. It has been brought to my attention that there is a reference in Appendix 2 with respect to the re-routing of the Lakeshore Road which outlines a proposed or future re-routing and that is figure 214, Appendix 2.

THE CHAIRMAN: Perhaps Eldorado could discuss that tomorrow and we will move to our last speaker. Thank you, Mr. Dykstra.

MR. BILL PEDEN: I have been asked to come and talk about experiences that I have had in the past in the area of Port Granby and Port Hope. I am presently associated with the Environmental Centre at Ryerson Polytechnical Institute and belong to a small business firm as well. However, in the past, I was an executive director of Energy Probe and that is the area that I would ask to come and speak to. I am not going to be speaking at all tonight about any kind of concerns about whether the plant should be built at the Port Granby site. I have been asked hopefully to confine myself to describing my experience in the past with Eldorado. I guess, in that way, my

comments will be in directly making comments on Eldorado as a responsible corporate citizen in Port Hope and in Ontario, as a steward of the earth as we all should be.

I would like to refer to a day in June of 1975 in the initial investigation of dumping facilities in and around Port Hope and Port Granby that eventually led AECB to investigate and turn up the radon gas and other things in the Town of Port Hope itself. How this came about is that I was called upon by Jerry Deegle of the CBC News and he said that he was going down to take a Geiger counter, which actually turned out to be a meter -- I am not too familiar with the measuring -- it was a way of measuring radioactive materials, as material levels. He wanted me to come along because of my expertise and I said that I wasn't an expert on the subject, but that I had known for a number of years about some of the situations that had happened, for instance what happened with the cattle 15 years ago at the Welcome site, which caused the closing down of that Welcome site.

So, we set out one fine morning and we got ourselves to the fence and found out that we risked five years in jail climbing over the fence and we took a look at each other and we decided we would

risk it and over we went. At that point we began investigating. This was at the Port Granby Town site. We began investigating at this point and we found a large pond full of a liquid and to identify what it was we collected some of that liquid to take back for analysis. We then explored the open pits which were used for the dumping or uranium tailings and miscellaneous materials such as a ladder, gloves and clothes and things like that that I assumed had come into contact with radioactivity in the plant and had to be dumped in the pits. The pit at this time was open. There were I think one, two, or possibly three large pits with uranium tailings and miscellaneous radioactive material in it.

I was at this time taking readings on the measuring device. The readings were in the low area. I am not sure, and this is probably going to apply to most of the things I am talking about, because I am relying on my memory, I am not sure of the exact data and this is just essentially trying to relate my impressions from my memory of this. The readings were taken at those open pits, at the dumping site area, the readings were, I believe, in the area of 5 to 8 MilliRems -- does that sound right? MilliRems per hour? Anyway, it was in the low range of radiation. What bothered us was the open pits.

There was no cover. Anyone could get in, even children.

We also walked to the edge of the site and looked down over the hill and we could see the entire hill completely scarred away. The vegetation had all ceased to exist essentially, and it was burned out and brown. There were yellow streaks going down the side of the hill. There was also a faulty fence where people could get into that particular area. I think it had somehow fallen down. There was even open access to the beach area. We saw the area on the hill and investigated it further and there appeared to us to be extensive leeching in the area. There were yellow streaks which we assumed at the time were probably leeching of uranium tailings that were being dumped in the area. I don't know to this point whether it was true.

I think in the investigation they determined, what was later to be determined, that pond contained nitric acid that was used in the uranium processing and that definitely was leaking into the water table and down into Lake Ontario at that time.

We then wandered back. Strangely enough, it has been talked about here, about the Ministry of the Environment -- we passed -- I think

he was from one of the Ministries, an environmental man who was monitoring there at that time with a little meter. We didn't stop and talk to him, but he was there. We stayed around and a truck drove in filled with chemicals that it was dumping in the pond. I believe we saw a truck dump 2500 gallons, I think that was the capacity of the truck. I don't know whether it was completely full, but talking to the truck driver, apparently they put about maybe five of those kinds of loads in at that particular period. The gate was open at that time. We went out and we were talking with various people in the area, talking about the trucks with uranium tailings, without markings or coverings.

At that time we went to the town area itself and we took a look at, I believe, the old Monkey Hill, Pigeon Point. The dump in the Port Hope area. The areas are now sealed off, but we took a look at the area where also had occurred years before, chemical leeching from the old Monkey Hill, Pigeon Point dump. It was like a moonscape. Apparently a lot of vegetation had come up in the meantime. They had thoroughly scarred that area and that was responsible for moving the dump to the Welcome site. That area was off limits so we took radiation readings all over that area and we saw only

very little radiation, maybe three or four, which was almost above background radiation.

We then proceeded up to the Welcome area site. The Welcome area site is one, where to my knowledge the leeching had also occurred about 15 years before, and there had been quite a bit of trouble with the cattle down the hill. Whatever was being dumped, or the problem had gotten into the underground water and had affected the cattle and caused Eldorado to shut that dump site down and move it, I believe, to the present site at Port Granby.

I believe it went from Pigeon Hill where the leeching occurred to the Welcome site and the leeching occurred there and they then go to Port Granby, but the leeching continues. There is no cattle or residents below. It is just Lake Ontario.

It was at Welcome, this was about 5:30 in the afternoon, and it was getting late, and we were getting ready to go, and we took readings. Welcome had a lot of yellow dirt mounds, sort of dirt covered over, but some tailings or some dumps just below the surface. We found we were getting into the middle range. It would be between 8 and 15 MilliRems per hour. Again, I am not positive of the reading in the low area. Actually the camera crew

was with us and they went home, because it was too late to film. I saw a rather large dump site and on it a pile of grey dirt. And I said, have you ever tested this, because these people had been out sort of looking at the site before, and they said they hadn't. So, I grabbed the little machine and I started walking up -- by the way the site had been closed down for 15 years. I think you are aware that it was approximately about that time.

I started walking up to the site and the machine was off -- and to let you in on what was going to happen, I didn't know it had a warning bell. It had a warning buzzer. I stood right in the middle of the grey dust at about the end of that table and I sort of -- well I only spread out about this far, but I had been there for quite a while and I put the machine down and turned it on and the warning signal went. I was sure that my children were all going to be mutants forever. I just had enough time to glance down to where the meter was and it was around 300 to 500 or 30 or 50, but definitely in the dangerous area, medium danger for sure.

Well, I jumped off the hill and turned off the buzzer and took off running down the hill, coming to the realization that here, again, was a very dangerous situation and I don't know, because we

didn't take samples of that, but here you had lying out in the middle and this was on top of the hill and the wind was blowing a definitely dangerous substance. Someone had deposited tailings from uranium and it was not covered. It was sitting out. If the dump had been closed and this had been dumped before the dump was closed, who knows what that wind had been blowing all around.

I was really upset that something like this could blow into the environment like that. There were residential homes, a few scattered in the area. Also it was blowing into the environment at that point. I was also quite upset at what I saw at Granby in terms of leeching, open pit dumping, that people, a Crown Corporation were violating the Waste Management Act, and no private corporation could get away with that.

So, we took the stuff to be analyzed at the University of Toronto and I believe it was nitric acid. The tailings, the yellow stuff was strictly tailings and we did a little investigation and called for the Atomic Energy Control Board investigation at this point.

Before releasing anything, I attempted to get in touch with the corporate personnel, I believe the vice-president at Eldorado

Nuclear. They didn't want to hear anything about it. I also discovered in my research that I hadn't discovered anything new. Everything we discovered at that point, including the hauling of uranium tailings in unmarked vehicles and vehicles not covered, and the leeching area, that these things had been sighted. I think it was seven or ten years earlier, by Douglas Andrews, and apparently Eldorado had made some statements, yes, we'll clean it up, but nothing had changed in that time that we had come through.

So, anyway, we decided to contact Eldorado Nuclear. We had no contact with them. They refused to see us. As a matter of fact, we also tried to contact or discuss it with the Atomic Energy Control Board of Canada. To this day I don't think that the Atomic Energy Control Board really did come to us and say what are your findings, in other words, work with us. I think they went and did their own investigations and I will say I had no idea that there was also a lot of tailings in the town itself, under the school building and things like that.

We continued, of course, to work in this process. When the full investigation came out, we found that the AECB tended to be an apologist for the industry instead of placing blame

and attempting to assess where it came from, who should pay for it and things like that.

In light of my experience, whether the plant should be built or whether it wouldn't be built or expanded, I don't know, but there have been a number of questions raised here about Eldorado's corporate responsibility and environmental responsibility in terms of assessment. It is my understanding that they had done an assessment and, in fact, I read an assessment on the Port Granby site, before they moved in and they talked about the water table being such that the same thing would gradually begin to take place after 20 years after the opening of the site. I don't know how many years Granby was open, but the leeching had already started at that time.

Apparently this whole area was investigated. The water table is very hard to predict in terms of environment, but we also were reiterating the point again that violation of the Atomic Energy Control Board Regulations, in terms of leaving that stuff open in the Welcome area, and in terms of not having radiation areas well marked and protected in terms of the hauling of tailings and things like that.

One other point I have to make and this

was in connection with the contact with Eldorado. The only contact I had in the whole time or our organization had with Eldorado was a radio interview that was done after the whole thing had been blown up because of what we found in Port Hope itself, with, I believe, the head or one of the heads and the safety officer, whose first name I believe was Stan.

At that time I asked him about whether he was aware of the investigation that had gone on in the United States, particularly as a result of the Colorado mine tailings. We asked specifically about the literature concerning this and he said he was not familiar with it and there was so much in the field it was hard to keep up. There is very little.

I was also kind of upset that Dr. Anderson had made these concerns known to Eldorado years before and Eldorado had knowledge, prior knowledge that there were problems with the tailings and what was under the houses. I don't know what was available, but I know they had knowledge and the initiative had been taken to cause them to look into the problem, which they did not do. So, on that point we have never been able to work with or talk to them or involve them in the process of taking responsibility for this kind of thing. They did have

prior knowledge and probably did not act in the best corporate citizen or self-enlightenment manner in their own investigation of this area or in not calling the Atomic Energy Control Board, and again, this violation of the Waste Management Act.

People have asked or it has been said here that Eldorado is doing assessments. We will do assessments, don't you trust the government to give you assurances that you will be protected and the AECB that everything is hunky-dory and taken care of. I have one answer. It might happen. These people might change. I don't know why a Crown Corporation is worse than most private corporations. From my experience in the past, it has not been so and it has not been found to be trustworthy. I think any examination of this project should make sure that the kinds of things and concerns we have tabled in this area are just so airtight that these regulations must be obeyed and clean-ups must be taken and that the corporation takes responsibility for the overseeing of it.

MR. SHIKAZE: Mr. Peden, with all due respect to yourself and the CBC in identifying this problem that you have related, have you been to the site recently with respect to what Eldorado has done and do you have any other observations

with respect to perhaps what your investigations have resulted in?

MR. PEDEN: No.

DR. BIRD: Mr. Peden, I would like to ask you a few more questions about the actual measurements you made at the time you were down there. I tried to make notes, but I wasn't very successful in connection with the kind of instrument that was used. I am not sure that you were sure you remembered yourself. Could you give me a little bit more about that particular instrument you used.

MR. PEDEN: At that time, I really knew what it was, but at this point all I know is that it wasn't a Geiger counter. It was an instrument used for measuring radiation MilliRems per hour.

DR. BIRD: Was it an ion chamber?

MR. PEDEN: That isn't what we called it.

DR. BIRD: Do you know where it came from?

MR. PEDEN: The reporter actually leased it from a company who had radiation measuring equipment.

DR. BIRD: Have you ever carried out radiation measurements before or since?

MR. PEDEN: No I haven't.

DR. BIRD: In actual fact, you were not very well qualified to interpret the readings as to whether they were serious or not. You were simply taking the indication of a scale value in saying since it was high on the scale or rang an alarm, it must be serious?

MR. PEDEN: I know it was. I am saying that I know it was calibrated before it was taken out, because it was measuring accurately. I went by the measurement that was shown on the machine and I knew from the Atomic Energy Control Board Regulations, as I say in all cases with the exception of the Welcome site, we found only low level readings and it was in the safe area. In the Welcome site, the readings I took according to the machine, both the warning signal and the buzzer, the needle was pointing in the 30 to 50 MilliRems per hour. It was in the medium to dangerous area on short term and definitely in the danger area for long term radiation.

DR. BIRD: The scale indicated different settings for long term hazards and short term?

MR. PEDEN: Yes, on the machine it was indicated low, medium and dangerous. I was also supplementing that with the Atomic Energy Control

Board standards and they have a warning buzzer when you reach the end of the safe level and that went off at that point. But, all our readings were in the safe level before.

DR. BIRD: When you say it was calibrated before you went, what do you mean? You checked it?

MR. PEDEN: That's true. I did not check it. It was calibrated. I asked and was assured that it was calibrated at a site where we picked it up and the reporter made sure of this.

DR. BIRD: Maybe it is of some interest to you to know that, in fact, it is very difficult to calibrate instruments of this type, particularly when you don't know what radiation you are measuring. Most are differentially sensitive to different types of substances. It may have been calibrated for some kind of radiation that it wasn't used for.

MR. PEDEN: Possibly. But it scared me.

MR. DUNCAN: I would be curious to know, Mr. Peden, what AECB regulations to which you are referring?

MR. PEDEN: First of all, the hauling of tailings in unmarked vehicles.

MR. DUNCAN: That is just one of them. I am really referring to ones you just referred to in terms of the measurements you had taken.

MR. PEDEN: Measurements?

MR. DUNCAN: Yes.

MR. PEDEN: Well, the regulations or the standards that had been set up. There were a list of say, from medium, safe, -- as far as I recall what we were using was -- you know, a set of standards that we got from AECB literature that we had with us. They were also verified by University of Toronto professors when I took it back. I told them what the levels were that we were reading. Those were simply subjective valuations at the time, and that was what was on the meter. They also gave us the information and verified the information.

MR. DUNCAN: It is rather curious because the Atomic Energy Control Board regulations do not refer to rates of radiation. They refer in terms of integrated doses over a period of time, which is usually longer than the time period you are talking about. The important thing here, I would think, is to have information generated during that period which could be of use in the future. Do you have any documentation of what you did?

MR. PEDEN: Three years later you

ask for it?

MR. DUNCAN: Do you have any information in terms of the effect of the radiation and so forth? It would be very helpful.

MR. PEDEN: We had it. I believe we sent a copy of that on our own initiative to the Atomic Energy Control Board. There was a continuing investigation at the time by that organization. We may even have it still on file. I think it was sent to John Jenkins, but if it is not on file, then I am sure it is still on file at Energy Probe and you can get it from the beginning up to the further investigations.

MR. DUNCAN: I think in this particular context it would be preferable if you were to put it forth. This is not an Atomic Energy Control Board forum.

DR. DEROW: I have a few questions. When you came down to Welcome and Port Granby, were you acting as part of Energy Probe at that point? You referred to Energy Probe earlier.

MR. PEDEN: Yes, I was. I was the Director of Energy Probe at that time.

DR. DEROW: And you are now an energy consultant?

MR. PEDEN: With the Ryerson Energy

Centre.

DR. DEROW: It would be nice if you could write us.

MR. PEDEN: On what?

DR. DEROW: On your findings. It seems your expertise could be used. We would really welcome additional materials on these projects.

MR. PEDEN: On uranium supply and demand?

DR. DEROW: Yes.

MR. PEDEN: It certainly has a bearing on this area.

DR. DEROW: It would be nice if we could get that kind of material from you.

MR. PEDEN: Okay. But the kind of material that I have, that kind of thing has been documented fairly well. If you want my interpretation---

DR. DEROW: Well there is daily new information and since it is such a contentious field, I would appreciate any information you have. You said you were asked to come here and speak tonight about what you were doing. I am wondering who asked you. Why did you come?

MR. PEDEN: SEAP asked me to come. I should say that I appreciate your allowing me to come and I must say that in a way it is nostalgic.

Four years ago I came down to this very building, although we didn't have bowling that night and we talked with the Mayor of Newcastle ---

THE CHAIRMAN: In view of the hour, I hope we don't get into nostalgia night.

MR. PEDEN: We came down with John Lang and I was first getting involved in the energy business and we talked about Darlington, if they were going to build a plant there. We talked about the environmental impact and four years later, here I am.

DR. DEROW: You made a point that we should be very careful that the regulations or the company is bound into meeting the regulations.

MR. PEDEN: Yes.

DR. DEROW: And you made reference to the fact that you felt that a controlling agency shared the same interest as Eldorado Nuclear, which may or may not be true. I was wondering if, in your view in your participation in energy related matters, if you could describe briefly or clarify what you meant by this kind of control and what do you see as the role for other sorts of groups to play in such a process?

MR. PEDEN: Well, that really is a very major subject and brings us into the area of

planning. We are crossing over into the area of soft technology. We are developing the kinds of regulations, the kinds of planning, urban planning that has to be supplied in terms of regulations of this area. I am not going to make any recommendations. Do you mean in terms of public participation? Then, I will make two comments. I don't know how to get Eldorado, which more than other Crown Corporations, like, for instance, Ontario Hydro with which I have had extensive experience -- Eldorado has shown a real insensitivity to talk with people, groups like myself or people within the community about this kind of problem or to take responsibility for the kind of potentially dangerous problems like Dr. Andrews had stated. I don't know how it can happen. You can't regulate it into being. You have to instill the corporate attitude. They have to realize that they are stewards of the earth like everyone else.

Secondly, the Atomic Energy Control Board, I didn't say they had the same interests as Eldorado. What I did say is that -- well, maybe, I am a very impatient young man, but they came to the town and became apologists for the industry, trying to allay people's fears, which was probably a necessary thing. On the other hand, to me they were not acting very much as a protector of the

people, which should be their role, the protectors of the environment in this case. That was my impression at that time. I feel there should be a stronger role of the AECB, as protectors as opposed to apologists.

MR. SHIKAZE: You mentioned you haven't visited the site recently, but also you made the statement as to whether you asked the question, will Eldorado change its attitude or its activity in this particular area. Would you be prepared to go to Port Granby today and look at it? There has been a number of changes there over the years. Then would you give us your impression as to anything they have changed?

MR. PEDEN: I hope so. I think the thing that bothered me the most is that I look at what Dr. Andrews did years before and the statements that were made back then, that, yes, they were upset and they were going to do some more assessment and clean it up and be good people again. That was, you know, it was almost the exact same wording.

I assume now with the kind of publicity they have received, they have done something about it. I would be prepared to go and see Port Granby, but I understand they still have a problem and they are going to keep the Port Granby

site open.

MR. SHIKAZE: That is part of their proposal.

MR. PEDEN: Well, I thought because of the leeching problem that they were going to have to move the entire site.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any further questions?

MR. GRANT: I am having a little difficulty with this witness, Mr. Chairman. As I understand the evidence, he is not now and was not then an expert in the field of radiation measurement.

MR. PEDEN: Yes.

MR. GRANT: Mr. Bird asked him what kind of instrument it was he used to measure radiation and he didn't know.

MR. PEDEN: That's right.

MR. GRANT: Dr. Bird asked him questions about the calibration of the instrument and he wasn't able to provide any answer.

He has referred to the Atomic Energy Control Board which is composed of a number of highly skilled and specialized persons in the Atomic Energy field and he is referred to this body as apologists for the industry. Yet, this man has the gall to suggest that my client takes no cognizance of his petty concerns. It is common knowledge and visible

that my client has built the water treatment plant which you haven't taken the time to look at. I would like to ask you one very important question, when you went to the residue sites, did you measure the radioactivity at the boundaries of the fences which you climbed over?

MR. PEDEN: Yes, I did.

MR. GRANT: And what measurements did you have?

MR. PEDEN: Safe numbers. I would like to add to what you were just commenting on. I am only going from experience in the past. I know your client was made aware early in the 1950's if not in the 1960's about problems existing and they did not do anything about it. That is where my comment came from. My comments came from the Atomic Energy Control Board. It is not necessarily the men involved. There are good men and someone keeps them from doing their job and someone at the Atomic Energy Control Board acts as an apologist as opposed to a protector.

MR. GRANT: By your own admission you are not an expert in this area.

MR. PEDEN: I might not be an expert, but if it wasn't for me and people like me, you would still be sitting on that stuff in Port Hope.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, we are getting a bit out of hand. It is obvious the representatives of SEAP are here and if you want to continue to applaud ---

A CITIZEN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make an objection at you allowing a debate here. I started to talk earlier tonight and have been stopped and told I was debating. This night is not for debating. I am sorry that the Chairman has allowed this to go on.

MARY CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to take you to task. You say members of SEAP. We are the people. Forget SEAP. We are the people who live in this area.

THE CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, which area are we talking about?

MARY CLARK: The area of Port Granby.

CARL ROSE: This has to do with the Atomic Energy Control Board in the United States, I understand that their Atomic Energy Commission has the job or did have -- and I am not up to date on this -- but as of a few years ago it did have the job of promoting nuclear energy at the same time as it has been regulating the industry. Is that the same in Canada? Is the Atomic Energy Control Board an arm of the Atomic Energy Commission or are they

completely separate?

MR. PEDEN: Well, it is my evaluation that AECB may be different. It is a different organization. It always has been. One problem that is difficult in Canada is that you do not have a wide variety of expertise in terms of what you have in the U.S. Until recently the agency had a very limited budget and most of the staff -- there is a closer relationship between AECL and AECB and Eldorado in terms of staff. This appears minimal, but the kind of valuation, the problem is the objective valuation you should have. Also you will continue to have a problem and I am not sure what kind or what the problems will be, but we have not had the problems as the U.S. has had.

MRS. LAWSON: One quick question. Mr. Peden, could you help us clarify the order of events that led up to all the troubles in Port Hope? When did Jerry Deegle make the film -- when was it shown on the CBC?

ME. PEDEN: Well, this happened for two years prior to this story. Then, of course, the Elliott incident brought tailings down to that area and we made that film which was in June 1975. Allan Lawrence picked it up and asked the AECB to take a look at this and apparently, I'm not sure

exactly what the sequence was, but the AECB announced that it would take a look at the situation. Then they went from there and looked at the whole area.

MRS. LAWSON: The houses and then St. Mary's School and so on?

MR. PEDEN: I don't know exactly. There was the housing thing, but the film was made.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have one more speaker. Mr. Henry Lise who asked to speak this evening.

SUBMISSION BY MR. HENRY LISE:

I can't be here tomorrow night and I really have something to say as a resident of this area about how I feel. It doesn't concern Eldorado directly, but it concerns nuclear power period, whether it is in Port Granby, Ontario, whether it is exported to the U.S., or whether it goes anywhere in the world.

I am against nuclear power period and I would like to share that with the panel.

My gut reaction is simply that not enough homework has been done about what happens to the waste. There are wastes that we don't know much about. We don't even know how to get rid of them right now. They will continue to be a pain, not only to us, but to our children, our grandchildren and

subsequent generations.

Now, I am referring to plutonium. I realize that is not produced by Eldorado. On the other hand, I do realize uranium is used to produce nuclear power and is a result of the CANDU reactor which is exported to other parts of the world, whoever will take them, and the result is plutonium which is a very dangerous substance and what do we do with that?

I am concerned with the world as a whole, not just this particular area. I feel that you are responsible for me as a steward of God's creation, not to oppose anyone who is polluting or creating poisons, plutonium, in the environment. Those that have spoken in favour of building the dump site have given as one of their major reasons that there is a shortage of energy. That to me in itself is a question. It was a question before the National Energy Board. It was a big question before the Berger Inquiry, whether we indeed do have an energy shortage. It depends on whose figures you look at. If you look at the oil companies and Ontario Hydro, perhaps. I think there are other figures and other research being done.

Therefore, since nuclear energy, it seems to be more developed than other renewable

energy sources, let's have it. To me, there is something wrong with that assumption. Unfortunately, the speakers that have spoken in favour have assumed there is an energy shortage have not thought through the fact that they are at the same time inviting indestructable wastes into the environment. I am talking about pollution again.

The main consumers of vast amounts of energy in our society are the big business. They are encouraged in Ontario to use more energy and more energy, because the more they use, the cheaper it is for them. Okay. There are statistics available that will show you that the energy consumed by a bigger corporation, big business, they pay for it at less than cost. The average consumer, the average household pays for energy above cost.

What I am suggesting is that if we would take a conservation attitude, and if we would say to the businesses, as they have done in California, if you say to the big businesses, the more energy you use, your costs will escalate accordingly, and the more it will cost. So it is not the more you use the cheaper it is. I think that should be turned around.

Once that is turned around, then, I think instead of having a shortage of energy we will

have a surplus of energy which will give us enough time, ten years, if I can use that figure that Justice Berger has thrown out, ten years of a period of study so that we could really have a look at what happens to the waste of nuclear energy.

I really think that whole idea ought to be considered, because I realize that this is a hearing for the local environment. But I don't see how you can make a decision as a panel without considering the larger questions that enter into the picture.

So, I think it is really important to find out, you know, to find out at least what we can do with the wastes before you start building plants. I want to say I am against nuclear power and any industry dealing with it because we have an exhaustive waste to conserve and we must first learn to be stewardly with what God has put us, mankind, in charge of. Thank you.

MR. LANG: You are a resident of where?

MR. LISE: Bowmanville which is closer to the Darlington nuclear power plant.

THE CHAIRMAN: One question, Mr. Lise. You mentioned you are opposed to nuclear power, but I get the impression that the main reason

was because the waste problem was not solved. If it was solved, would you be in favour of nuclear power?

MR. LISE: If there is absolutely no damage to the environment. Yes, I think nuclear power is fine, but I need to be convinced that there is no damage to the environment. As a citizen, I can't let his happen.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any other questions?

A CITIZEN: I wonder if you could expand on this a little more. I presume what you are saying is that Eldorado is exporting around the world where they can get a contract in terms of what the federal government lays down. Would you consider that, supposing it was to Argentina or Algeria, have you considered this? Are you trying to say what these countries are doing with their spent fuel out of the process, through the nuclear power station? They have then spent through. Where are they putting it? How are they supporting it and is Eldorado actually going to export pollution, if you like?

MR. LISE: I don't know if I understand your question completely, but I do understand that Eldorado is exporting their refined uranium to the States. I heard you mention some other

country. I also understand that the wastes produced by that refinery process will stay here in this area.

A CITIZEN: You mean the wastes from the refining of the other into the UF6 will stay here.

MR. LISE: Right.

A CITIZEN: But, the UF6 will go into a generating station in another country, maybe even a third world.

MR. LISE: Yes.

A CITIZEN: And what will then go into the generating station will come out as a highly radioactive material. Were you trying to expand on that point? If you are not, I would.

MR. LISE: Well, actually I am not prepared to.

A CITIZEN: Well, if I may, panel, I don't know what your terms of reference are, but I do consider the problem of world pollution and I am wondering if you are really considering local pollution in Canada or are you looking at the overall picture in the world. Mr. Chairman, you mentioned if the problems of what to do with spent fuel weren't there, there would be no need for us to be here because of the dump. But for nuclear energy -- that is outside of your scope now, but to me, this is a real problem. Are we really exporting pollution?

I hope you will consider this when advising your Minister.

THE CHAIRMAN: One of the other speakers suggested the reverse of this, and that is that the spent materials abroad be brought back to Canada for disposal. At that time I think he was speaking of using the Precambrian shield as an area for disposal. Would you feel happier if Canada's pollution problem, potential pollution problem was brought back to Canada for disposal?

A CITIZEN: Mr. Chairman, I happen to have visited Japan about 18 months ago and I was speaking to some American scientists who were building the nuclear station, and I asked the question, what are the Japanese doing with their spent fuel? They laughed and they said that is their problem, not ours. We are just here to start the generating station. Japan is a fairly well developed country, but what about Argentina or Algeria? What are they doing with it? Where are they dumping it? Are they going to dump it in the Ganges in India? I don't know. I think when you build washing machines and export it and it produces dirty laundry water, that's okay, but it is not dirty laundry water. This could perhaps destroy the world today.

DR. BIRD: Mr. Chairman, this last

exchange of questioning has resulted in my not being quite sure what Mr. Lise meant. I thought I had understood him to say that he was against nuclear power, nuclear energy anywhere and yet, in response to the recent questioning, he seems to withdraw from his concern on a world basis and only focus in on Canada. Now, I am really not sure.

MR. LISE: I didn't mean that. I am against nuclear power simply on the basis that we are producing poisonous gases and I don't care where we do this in the world. I am against nuclear power period until we look at it and really know what the wastes are all about, what it costs or what it doesn't cost or what happens to it.

DR. BIRD: So, the question has been asked by a number of other people tonight, supposing in the government policy, the Canadian government policy was changed and there was more encouragement to export the uranium without, in fact, doing any further processing of it here. Would you still be against that, if it was going to end up in a nuclear power reactor?

MR. LISE: Definitely, when there is price fixing involved.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you ladies and gentlemen.

MR. GRANT: One short question. I am sure we all share your concern about the disposal of waste, but have you ever given any consideration of the disposal of the waste from other forms of energy producing products?

MR. LISE: I am not in the field of energy. It is not my job. That is not what I am about at all. That's your problem. You are the one that is producing -- well, you are not the one producing energy, but the people that are producing energy, it is their job to do it in a responsible way and I don't see that.

MR. GRANT: I'm not trying to debate with you. I am trying to find out if that when you said you were generally concerned about the disposal of nuclear waste, and that is the reason why you said you were against the nuclear industry generally and against any industry associated with nuclear energy. The only reason you mentioned to Dr. Bird is that you are concerned about the disposal of waste. My question is are you concerned about the disposal of any other kind of waste used from, say, coal-fired generating stations? Have you considered the problems associated with that in terms of the trade-off?

MR. LISE: Certainly I am concerned about any waste that goes into the environment. I

think we ought to guard the environment against any kind of raping of it. I think that the waste produced by nuclear power is more dangerous than coal from my knowledge.

MR. WARREN LOWE: I am interested in what is being said about exporting the material. I have just come back from a trip to India and I have spent quite a bit of time talking to people from the universities there. I gather from the discourses I had that these people are as confused as we are. They are a segment that are for development of atomic energy there and there is also another group who are very fearful. Those who are fearful gave several reasons. One is that 75 per cent of our country are illiterate and we don't know whether we, if we go into this in a big way, we don't know if we can get the personnel to police this sort of thing. I think that in itself is a big question. On the other hand, we have all kinds of sun and others told me they would be very pleased if we could give them some technological development in collecting solar energy.

MR. VELDHUIS: I'm sorry to be so late. I have hestitated, but I had better get this off my chest. I think a little bit earlier you made some comments about something to the effect that it is clear that members of SEAP are here. Mrs. Clark

pointed out at that time to forget about SEAP, because we are concerned and I hope that your remarks were meant in a general nature, not in a way that will prejudice anyone here. As she stated and I have stated, we are citizens of this area. We live in Port Granby and we are vitally concerned about what goes on and we are also members of SEAP and members of churches and so on and so forth. That is not the point here. We hear something and in our exuberance and enthusiasm we applaud if that was a good point. If someone of some other persuasion makes a good point we would do likewise, I am sure. It is simply a case of us showing our approval for the points made and not to be here as a pressure group. We are just here as citizens of the area, vitally concerned, terribly concerned about the outcome of this.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Veldhuis. I stand corrected.

--- Whereupon the hearing adjourned until 1:30 on October the 5th.